

The
South Atlantic Quarterly.

A Plea for the Union of Methodism in America

By JOHN C. KILGO,

President of Trinity College

The issue which sixty-two years ago divided Episcopal Methodism of America into two ecclesiastical bodies was a political issue. There was no contention as to the fundamental doctrines nor the general principles of polity in the Methodist Church. Abolitionism was a political sentiment and looked to political sentiment for its promotion. Besides, it was necessarily a sectional issue.

However, from the days of Jefferson and Hamilton all political questions became sectional questions. It was the aim of Jefferson to develop American democracy after the type of French democracy, while Hamilton was unyielding in his purposes to shape it after the type of English democracy. The fundamental issue of the nation's character lay in the issue between these two men, and every question which arose, whether it was assumption of debts, defense of American commerce, tariff protection, states' rights, or abolition, became a sectional question.

It was not possible to keep the churches of America free from the sectional form which national issues took, and least of all was it possible to keep the Methodist Church clear of it. Its members in the South were involved by every consideration in the institution of slavery and only disaster could come of the southern ministry taking an aggressive attitude against the institution; the members of the Methodist Church throughout the North were equally committed to abolitionism and could not be otherwise. This was a condition—a sectional condition—which the Church had nothing to do

with creating, but all to do with in serving the people among whom it labored.

The General Conference of 1844 found separation the wise course of action, a course which it would have avoided had there been another way open. The representatives from each section were painfully conscious of the crisis that was upon them and the hesitancy with which they came to the inevitable conclusion shows the sorrow which they all suffered. The spirit, as well as the terms of separation, were highly creditable to the sincerity and brotherly sympathies of those who acted in this grave matter.

Had the spirit in which the division was agreed to suffered no change the two bodies of Methodism would have filled their missions in the nation and held each other in the esteem of a holy fellowship. But the sentiment of abolitionism grew intense and passionate while anti-abolitionism kept pace in its spirit of opposition. The inevitable clash came and the issue which divided Methodism gathered to itself all the passion and hatred of a dreadful war. Southern Methodists and Northern Methodists had fought and suffered and died in the cause which only a few years previous had led to their friendly severance into two ecclesiastical bodies.

War hatreds and sectional enmities had put a new force into all the relations of the two sections of the nation and the two bodies of Episcopal Methodism were driven far apart by these new conditions. These feelings engendered by the war have been provoked and perpetuated by very many unnecessary and unbrotherly deeds and words which have tended to delay the possible return of the two bodies of Episcopal Methodism to their original fellowship. No good can come of rehearsing any of these things which do discredit to the spirit of a Christian organization. Each side has much to repent of, each side has much to forgive; while neither side should be slow to practice both these virtues.

But the chief issue before Methodism in America is not a defense of the past, not to prove the rights of differing bodies, or to justify the course of each division. The supreme question is a re-union into a permanent fellowship worthy of the great Providence that has protected this Ameri-

can nation and the divine spirit which should in all things control the faith and feelings of the Christian church. The time has come when separation cannot be justified, and the apologetic attitude which it forces will only result in a weakened faith and a wasted energy. All the issues which led to separation have been settled for all time and the memory of dead issues should not persist with more power than the necessities of vital duties and tasks which call for the combined zeal of all men in all quarters of the earth.

The question of states' rights is a settled question. The meaning of the Constitution of the nation may still be discussed as an academic question, but that document was virtually rewritten at Gettysburg and Appomatox, and whether Calhoun or Webster was the sounder in his views is now no matter of concern. Lee and Grant found the verdict of the discussion and the case will not again be opened.

It has been forever settled that slavery cannot exist on this continent. The South has accepted the settlement of the slavery question and regards the freedom of the negro as a greater blessing to the white man than it was to the negro. The relation of the two races is working itself to a sane solution and is accepted by wise men in all parts of the nation.

There never has been any difference in the fundamental doctrines of the two branches of Methodism. The Twenty-five Articles of Religion have remained unchanged as the creed of American Methodism.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church have held faithfully to an episcopal form of government. The constitution of each branch of Episcopal Methodism protects its polity against a rash and radical change.

The early and heroic history of Methodism in America is the common heritage of both branches of Methodism. Their doctrinal unity is sanctified by the glorious labors of that host of men who wrought in the early times of the nation's life and to whose labors must be credited very much of the nation's prosperity.

Both of these branches of Methodism have their home in America and get their civil protection from the same great

government. Their members are citizens of this republic and must be concerned in all that is vital to the nation's life and progress. The perpetuation of sectionalism is no credit to any part of the nation and it has received the condemnation of all patriotic citizens. Commerce and industry have become a bond of union between the wide sections of the republic and men who have met in the markets have forgotten all the feelings of a former strife. Recent events in our national history have called out the patriotic fidelity of American citizens and bound them in a new and stronger national brotherhood.

Within the past few years efforts have been made to conform the two branches of Methodism. These efforts have been fruitful in securing a common catechism, a common hymnal, and a common form of worship. Besides these agreements have been reached by which missionary operations in foreign lands are harmoniously organized.

In all matters of vital importance Episcopal Methodism is at one and its complete union seems to be suggested by every consideration. Those who think it not advisable base their opinions upon considerations scarcely sufficient to defend the division between the churches. None of these objections have any direct relation to the original issue which brought about the separation, but are conditions which have developed through the experiences of later years.

One of the chief causes set forth why it seems inadvisable, if not even impossible, for the two branches of Methodism to re-unite, is the widely different views which the two churches hold concerning the negro problem. The southern church suspects that the northern church entertains the idea of social equality, and the northern church suspects that the southern church utterly disregards the claims of the negro to all just opportunities of progress. Very much in these two notions is mere assumption intensified by feelings of suspicion which have come out of the strains of former conflicts. Neither side has been entirely patient and painstaking to ascertain the real attitude of the other to this delicate and difficult problem and, hence, much careless talk has been indulged in on both sides.

The supposed differences of attitude to the negro problem should rather hasten than hinder the re-union of Methodism. The welfare of the negro will not be helped by making him a subject of perpetual contention. He will take sides with those whom he considers his friends and develop a dislike for those whom he considers opposed to them who help him. The contention will beget in him all sorts of partisan prejudices which will dwarf his character and fill him with spite. Already he has been the victim of enough of white men's quarrels, and it would seem that that this unseemly conduct might be left to political parties without the sanction and patronage of the church of God.

The Methodist Church before its division was zealously interested in the religious life of the slaves in the southern states and thousands of them had membership in the white churches of the South. These received religious instruction from southern preachers and were greatly blessed in every respect by the instruction. Under the present order the northern church deals with the negro as a foreign missionary enterprise, not fully understanding all the difficulties involved in his life and character. It would be vastly better if the northern church would leave this work to the care of those who understand it best and among whom the negro must live and work. But there is no hope of bringing about such a desirable end except by first uniting the two branches of Methodism and re-establishing a confidence and co-operation which every principle of the Christian religion demands.

It is urged that the two branches of Methodism hold opposing views concerning the ecclesiastical rights of women, the northern branch admitting them to the assemblies of the church while the southern branch denies them this right. This is too small a difference upon which to defend the disunion of American Methodism, and betrays an unfortunate disposition to promote differences rather than shows a holy desire to promote fraternal fellowships. And certainly a wise plan of re-union could easily adjust this difference without changing the views of either branch of Methodism as to the rights of women to representation in church assemblies.

Likely the most serious source of division lies in the antagon-

onisms which have sprung out of the competitions of the two churches in the border states where they contend side by side. This contention has engendered in many instances feelings more intense and unkindly than those which naturally exist between denominations of widely varying creeds. A family quarrel is always persistent and intense. The very elements of unity seem to give rise to jealousy and friction.

While this unseemly contention is open to the gaze of all men it will not aid in its removal to rehearse details on either side in the hope of fixing the burden of blame. Such a discussion would only add to the antagonism, making the possibility of re-union a more hopeless task. To end this unholy contention is the one aim which should possess the thought of both sides. Its continuance will be an unbecoming exhibition of jealousy and dislikes while to end it will be a glorious example of faith and brotherliness. But so long as both branches of Methodism labor in the same region and build temple against temple there will continue to be increasing animosities which will widen the breach and delay the possibility of bringing American Methodism into the fulness of its strength and usefulness.

It has been urged that united Methodism would form an organization of such great size that it would be unwieldy, especially in its large legislative assemblies. The force of this objection to re-union is easily obvious though it is far from being a fatal objection. The division did not arise from an over-growth of Methodism and its prosperity should not be set forward as the chief obstruction to its re-union. It would be an easy task to divide the whole territory into three general conference sections, each of which could legislate for its own peculiar problems, while all missionary and world-wide enterprises could be managed through central boards and an ecumenical assembly. Certainly there is enough of statesmanship in American Methodism to adjust all the administrative tasks, and there should not be lacking the fraternal spirit to undertake the work.

None of these objections to re-union is of a serious nature, but all of them seem to be tinged with a strained effort to find some explanation for a situation which calls for a de-

fense. At this period of the world's history, when all the nations of the earth are moving under the impulse of immense prospects and responding to a feeling of universal kinship, the mightiest Protestant force in this republic cannot escape the just censure of the world if it weakens its usefulness in an unholy contention and wastes its energies in perpetuating an unnecessary division.

The calamity of a divided Methodism has been admitted in the efforts to adjust the more palpable difficulties through committees of federation, but this is a timid compromise of a sacred duty. If the adjustments of federation are achievements greatly to be desired, by what argument can it be shown that re-union would not be vastly more satisfactory? If a half-hearted fraternity is a blessing, why should a full hearted fellowship prove a calamity? If the union of Methodism is necessary for the good of Japan, why would it be an evil in America? Federation may be better than nothing and it may relieve some very hurtful points of friction, but it cannot displace the higher duty and the holier privilege of an organic union.

Economic considerations more than suggest the wisdom of the re-union of Episcopal Methodism. The financial resources of the churches in America are voluntary contributions and the duty to use these gifts wisely is a sacred duty. Nothing short of the most valid and obvious reason can satisfactorily explain the expenditure of money in an unnecessary competition of two ecclesiastical organizations that teach the same doctrines, have the same origin, hold to the same polity, and set up the same ideals. Why should the southern branch of the Methodist church tax its membership to build and sustain churches in California and Oregon and other regions in which the northern branch of Methodism is better established. Or why should the northern branch of Methodism continue to expend money in Tennessee and Texas and Florida, where the southern branch of Methodism is meeting all the demands? That such a policy is a reckless waste of money is beyond successful denial, and the arguments which have hitherto been presented to defend it utterly fail to satisfy the serious judgment of both churches. That there has not been

an open and vigorous protest on the part of leading laymen in each branch of Episcopal Methodism is an illustration of their patience rather than their approval of the policy. There are not wanting infallible signs that this patience and silence will soon give way to a protest that cannot be hushed with flimsy arguments.

The re-union of Episcopal Methodism will greatly increase its religious power and moral influence. Besides putting an end to the waste of power in jealousies and unholy bickerings, it will bring into one religious organization millions of members whose combined influence may be exercised for the correction of evils and the redemption of men. This consideration alone should inspire both branches of Methodism to forget every form of difference in the interest of multiplying their power. The evils that exist in governments, the wrongs that are rending society, the crimes that are disgracing commerce, the appalling shames that threaten home purity, and the degradation of uncivilized races unite their demands for every church organization to multiply its working forces and religious influences. Protestant denominations, varying widely in cardinal doctrines and traditions, have become conscious of a sore weakness arising from denominational differences and are seeking to unite their strength that they may better fill the mission of God's church in the earth. There has never gathered on the American continent a more significant assembly than the Inter-Church Conference on Federation which assembled in New York during the month of November, 1905. The single purpose which inspired that notable gathering was to strengthen the power of the churches in America. And if this union of denominations is felt to be a new resource of religious influence by what argument will Episcopal Methodism defend its disunion?

This federation of the Protestant denominations of America is an expression of a universal spirit of co-operation. The world has discarded the idea of segregation. The isolations of distance and natural obstacles have been fully overcome, while international commerce has created world-wide interests that must enter into the policies of each nation's government. The sense of international dependence is the

chief feature of our modern civilization. And every movement of progress is toward a wider and deeper co-operation of nations. Toward this end every agency at work in the world is lending itself. The advance of science renders all its service to bringing the ends of the earth nearer together, the projects of nations have their chief aim in the closer union of races and nations, while the sympathies of mankind are fashioned after ideals of universal kinship.

This spirit of universal kinship is one of the noble achievements of the Christian religion. Its great Founder was the first to give the world a cosmopolitan idea and an unlimited faith. He set aside all the provincialisms of races, broke through every wall of partition, disregarded every principle of separation and announced the unity of mankind—a unity that should be realized in a kingdom of righteousness and fellowship. For nineteen centuries the evolutions of history have unfolded in the direction of his teachings, constantly bringing the world toward his sublime ideal of the making of one family all the nations of the earth. He has ruled over the tendencies of the centuries and his ideas have taken permanent hold upon the minds of men.

It was the universal idea in the Christian religion that found its modern defenders in Methodism. John Wesley set no limits to the field of his operations, but declared his mission to be a world-wide mission. And the religious wonder of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was the rise and progress of Methodism. Today its missionary operations are more extensive than the missionary operations of any other Protestant church in the world. With amazing zeal it has responded to the commission to preach the gospel to all nations, and its labors have been among the leading forces that have wrought in behalf of a universal fellowship.

One cannot but be struck with the incongruity of Episcopal Methodism preaching and urging in Japan and China and India and Africa a union and fellowship which it steadily refuses to practice in its own America and among its own kin. And it is a severe reproof that the inconsistency of divided Episcopal Methodism gave such serious pain to Japanese converts that the two branches of Methodism had to

unite their work. The necessity of the re-union of the two churches is emphasized by every tendency of the world's progress and a refusal to respond to such a universal call can find no adequate defense.

The widest interests of this republic seem to insist upon the re-union of Episcopal Methodism. Warned by the universal failure of national churches and moved by a desire to preserve religious faith from all hurtful allegiances, the founders of this nation wisely separated church and state. This was done in the interest of religion, and the unprecedented prosperity of the Protestant churches in America is an overwhelming vindication of the policy. In no other nation on the earth has religious faith been so zealous, and the soundness of religious doctrines been preserved with a holier care.

While this republic has no national church and defends no special religious creed, yet there is no other nation whose existence and prosperity are more vitally dependent upon the purity and teachings of the Protestant churches. Nor is it going too far to say that Episcopal Methodism by the co-incidences of history, the democracy of its spirit, its steadfast faith in human liberty, and its patriotic fidelity has been one of the most potent forces in the building of our national power and influence.

There are many vital reasons that give national significance to the condition and influence of Episcopal Methodism. With its large membership, including all classes of people and reaching into every community of the republic, its purity and its fidelity are of supreme importance in the character of the nation. And at no previous period has there been such pressing necessity for the fullest exercise of all possible power of Methodism in the life of the nation. The multitudes of foreigners, untrained in the lessons and principles of freedom, given over to a life of abandonment, poisoned with all the hatreds of a hard experience, and unconcerned about the welfare of society and government, present a situation full of the most direful prospects. The evangelization of this abandoned multitude is one of the supreme tasks before the American people, and the evangelizing spirit and

energy of Episcopal Methodism were never before of more importance in the nation's life than they are at this time.

Every patriotic American should be constantly reminded that this republic is the world's greatest experiment in the principles of democracy and self-government. Such a government is, more or less, always in a crisis. Its very virtues become sources of danger. The hopes which it inspires tend to breed dangerous discontents, and the liberty which it confers tends to engender a reckless disregard of law. So in a democracy like this there must be a constant and a persistent training in the soundest principles of morals. In this and in this alone lie the safety and perpetuity of our republic and the final establishment of republicanism as the soundest form of government.

In working out these national principles to their highest destiny no other organization in America should render gladder and more efficient service than Episcopal Methodism. In the early period of the nation's history, when every idea was crude and every task of government difficult, American Methodism, through its itinerant ministry, was the most active force in laying the foundations of religious truth and teaching morality to the early settlers. Their labors were the conserving force of democracy at the moment of its greatest danger. And the work which the pioneers of Methodism did in the early stages of the nation's life must be repeated with increasing zeal as the nation advances in power. These national necessities should appeal to every patriotic impulse in Episcopal Methodism and cause it to unite all its resources in the most active form of service. And certainly nothing else could send forth into the nation's life a greater thrill of hope than the re-union of the divided churches, thus putting this greatest Protestant organization in the best shape to serve the nation's welfare.

But there is another consideration that should appeal with irresistible force to every lover of his country. Especially should it appeal to the two branches of Episcopal Methodism and hasten their re-union. The founders of this republic intended to organize under one central authority a number of separate governments, thus conserving the idea of local self-

government. The problem from the beginning was a complicated and difficult problem. Yet this government was to be a union of commonwealths not confederated by weak ties of agreement which could be severed in any moment and for any sort of a cause, but it was to be a government united by the strong bonds of a central authority. Such a government was unique and could not be made in a day. It was exposed to all the dangers of dissolution. The first hundred years of the nation's life was spent in trying to interpret the meaning of union. The long and bitter discussions, the rise and fall of passions, the growth of sectional oppositions, and the final crash of arms is the bloody route by which the end was reached. This republic is a union, and every patriotic citizen glories in the fact.

It will forever abide a sore memory in the thought of this nation that its history has been marred by an unfortunate sectionalism. This is the saddest blot upon its record. Patriotic Americans in every section feel it to be the sorest calamity that has yet befallen our national glory and strength. To heal the breach and restore every section of the nation to the bonds of an indestructible fellowship are ends which appeal to every genuine American.

It is highly creditable to the spirit of commerce and industry that they have set aside all sectionalism and united their resources to upbuild enterprises in every region. It is discreditable to the spirit of political parties that they depend upon the prejudices of sectionalism as a chief asset of party power. By every principle and every ideal of the Christian religion it would seem that the churches of America should be the most active leaders in restoring and re-enforcing the union. One cannot understand why sectionalism should have its most stubborn stronghold about the altars of the church of God. Is the Christian religion an unpatriotic religion? Does it foster animosities and estrange fellow-citizens? Will Episcopal Methodism add honor to its record by perpetuating a division which is a constant menace to national strength and national influence?

The real bond of this Union is not in the strength of its arms, the wisdom of its Constitution, nor the extension of

its wealth. It is in an inner sense of fellowship. And religion is the mightiest bond that unites mankind. It would be difficult to think of a greater contribution to the strength of the American Union than the coming together of the largest Protestant church in the nation. To effect this union of the two branches of Episcopal Methodism is an achievement in which all American citizens have vital interest. It carries with it immeasurable consequences to the prosperity and strength of the nation and should engage the thought and efforts of all Americans.

Literary Fashions*

BY BLISS PERRY,

Editor of the Atlantic Monthly

To those who really love literature, even its most transient modes have a certain meaning and interest. To one who does not love literature for its own sake, I fear any comment upon its passing, ever-varying forms may seem merely trivial,—a grave treatment of things not grave in themselves. The reading public is made up, indeed, of many who are not born readers, just as many persons go to the horse-show who are not real lovers of the horse. But at the horse-show there will always be found genuine admirers of horse-flesh. They establish the scale of values. They know by instinct the thoroughbred from the scrub. They have their whims, their temporary fashions, their insistence upon this or that arbitrary quality of action or of blood. The horse-show is a place of fads. It exhibits extravagancies of taste and fancy. But in the last analysis the horse-show is established upon the pure delight in a good horse. Literature, likewise, rests back upon love of a good book. The book may be enjoyed in solitude, as one may like to ride alone along a woodland path; and yet the reading of a good book, like the sight of a spirited animal, may give delight to thousands of admirers at once without lessening any one man's pleasure.

A book is, indeed, a thing to be tasted by one's own palate, to be read for the profit of one's own soul. But the book is also a product of its generation and its hour. It affords some evidence of the prevalent standards of conduct or of taste. Read by a crowd, it reflects the lineaments, the vagaries and passions of the crowd. An Elizabethan book, a Georgian book, a Victorian book will give you not only three different varieties of literature, but will reveal the habit of mind, the outward bearing, of three different types of Englishmen. To study their changing literary tastes, their whims and en-

*An address delivered May 24, 1906, at the commencement exercises of Wake Forest College.

thusiasms, is not merely to study the outer husks of literature; it is to approach, by however indirect a path, to the human life which underlies literature. The heroine of a romance will, under precisely similar unhappy circumstances, weep in 1785, in 1840 elope, and in 1906 join a college settlement. When you have observed this, you have, indeed, marked certain literary and social conventionalities of assent or rebellion, but you have learned something at the same time about the inscrutable ways of the eternal-feminine.

Is there not in all this a hint as to a certain watchfulness—a quick observation of the fashion of the time—which should be enjoined upon the lover of books? Not that he need read all the fashionable books of the season! Heaven forbid! But he ought, I think, to scrutinize more closely than he does the course of literary fashions. They should contribute to his amusement,—and they should set him to thinking. The task has been made doubly easy for us through the labors of a whole generation of historic and scientific criticism. This criticism has opened our eyes to many new phenomena. It has arranged many familiar facts under new laws. No doubt it has been here and there over-bold, over-sure. But it has taught us to recognize, more clearly than would have been thought possible fifty years ago, the spiritual continuity of any great national literature. There has been an ebb and a flow in English letters, for instance, but there has also been a progression, a current deepening and widening, growing clear or turbid, with the intellectual and emotional experience of the English people.

This new school of criticism has made us conscious of the origin and development, the disappearance or persistence, of this and that element in the national mind. It has traced the influence of climate and soil, institutions and politics, religion and social theory, upon the subject matter of prose and verse. This may sound formidable to the layman, but from Taine to his latest dissenting disciple, how attractively it has been served up to us. Before you can pass judgment upon Robert Burns, Mr. Henley will tell you just how much allowance you must make for Scotch blood and Scotch land-laws and Scotch whiskey and Whig politics and Calvinism. Pro-

fessor Barrett Wendell will show you the precise moment at which Transcendentalism began to stir in the New England soil, and he will mark its curious path across our native literature as plainly as a gardener can tell you when a mole is tunnelling under your lawn. Furthermore, these trained students of historical periods have mapped not only the evolution of ideas, but the parallel development of literary forms. Take, for illustration, the period of Puritanism. There is plenty here, surely, to reward the student of ideas, who wishes to observe the English mind elevated to noble heights of impassioned feeling. There is much to interest the student of rhetorical form, who tries to sound the converging streams of Classicalism and Hebraism as they roll through the great canyons of *Paradise Lost*. But the real vogue of Puritanism is not measured until one sees it coloring the common speech of the unlettered folk, until one hears its cant in *Peveril of the Peak* and *Woodstock* and *Old Mortality*, until one reads Cromwell's speeches and dispatches and remembers that all this is a dialect, a strange fashion—like that ill-fitting brown suit of Cromwell's made by a country tailor!—and that it was laid aside at the Restoration like any outlandish outworn garb.

Fashion likewise plays a curious role in the formation of literary types. Let us take the displacement of one literary type by another, as, for instance, the triumph of the psychological novel in this country and England in the seventies. It was easy to assert, and many critics did assert, that the time for the romance of adventure had forever gone by, that external events had proved less significant and interesting, artistically, than internal states of thought and emotion. It seemed to prove the truth of Professor Brander Matthews's pleasing theory that "Fiction dealt first with the Impossible, then with the Improbable, third with the Probable, and now with the Inevitable." The novel as written by George Eliot was gravely believed to be a finally fixed and superior type, as the toeless horse of today is superior to the three-toed horse of the Pliocene Age. And no sooner were these demonstrations completed to everyone's satisfaction than everybody straightway proceeded to read Stevenson's *Treasure Island*!

Now George Eliot's *Middlemarch* and Stevenson's *Treasure Island* are very perfect specimens of two different types of fiction. It is easy to say which type is the more highly organized. It is possible to say which type is in the abstract better fitted to survive. But before you can even guess which book is actually likely to survive longer, you must take into consideration many questions beside that of the abstract perfection of the types themselves. And the question of literary fashion is one of these unknown quantities in the equation. A serious minded critic can draw up a brief against the historical romance, as Mr. Howells has done more than once, and prove to his perfect contentment that as a distinct species of the art of fiction the historical romance is in the very nature of the case false and absurd. The reasoning is sound enough,—only in such cases people do not listen to reason! They read the books they like. When the success of Hugh Wynne, a sterling piece of work, revealed to our American novelists the interest felt by the great public in our own history, behold a sudden and still ripening crop of American historical romances, good, bad, and indifferent. It would puzzle a critic to trace any relation whatever between the artistic excellence of these various romances and their sales. The sale of any book is often in inverse ratio to its literary excellence. It is still harder to see that the type as a type has had anything to do with their extraordinary vogue. When you simply say that the American historical romance has been the fashion, you come nearer the scientific truth of the matter.

Or take another kind of American story which has been popular in recent years, the rural philosopher story, whose prototype was David Harum. Now David Harum would scarcely be ranked by any of us as a great book, a book of permanent value. Its workmanship is slovenly, its art amateurism to the last degree. We all read it and liked its freshness and its humor, but the fact that it outsold all competitors for a while, and the fact that new David Harums with new names and new overalls and tippets now smile at us from the advertising panels of every electric car, have little, if any, literary significance. And yet the lover of literature ought to note the social significance of these "best selling

books of the month." They illustrate on a great scale and in unmistakable terms how far the principle of imitation has carried us, in our modern democratic society. If everybody is reading Mrs. Wharton's *The House of Mirth*, have not most of us a sense of discomfort if we are not reading it too? How very stupid, not to say lonesome, looks the silly sheep that refuses to jump the wall while the others are hurrying headlong over! I do not mean that this tendency of human nature toward imitation is anything new. It is only lately, it is true, that specialists have begun to study the psychology of the crowd; but they have invented long names for facts that are as old as the first mob. It is human to follow your leader over the wall or into the ditch. It has always been so. You cannot give Aristophanes and Shakspeare any information about an American nominating convention. They have seen it already, in Athens and London, on press-tickets of their own!

Neither is the craze for the book of the hour anything new. Byron "woke to find himself famous"—as he said—in as literal a sense as any of the men and women whose faces stare us out of countenance in the public prints today. The difference lies in the universal diffusion of the contemporary newspaper and magazine, in the ready communication between literary capitals and country readers, in the development of the art of advertising. Literary notoriety is easier to gain than it ever was before. There are so many candidates for literary immortality that one grows confused if one stops to think about the merits of the claimants. It is really more simple to keep jumping with the rest of the flock, after the man of the hour! And Byron was at least allowed to wake and find himself famous; your modern candidate for fame seems to have a telephone in his bedroom and to be sleeplessly waiting until someone—perhaps only his press-agent—rings him up.

In short, the evolution of literary types under contemporary conditions does not seem to follow any known law of progress. There is action and reaction, a recoil from sentiment to brute fact and from brute fact back to sentiment: we grow romantic or realistic by cycles; we shift our anchorage from

prose to poetry, and back again to prose. From century to century a certain progression can indeed be traced, but by no means an invariable progress from lower forms to higher. Everywhere there is the invincible quest for novelty that lurks in the human spirit; the good things come and the good things go, but time and chance and change and fashion bring the best things round again, if one will only wait.

How does fashion affect the influence of the great writer? I have already remarked that the scientific criticism of literature makes scanty allowance for his power or caprice. Given a Thomas Carlyle, and every fact concerning his ancestry and early training, his falling in love with Jane Welsh and going to live in Craigenputtock and writing Sartor Resartus and coming up to be lionized in London, takes on a certain significance for the imagination. But you cannot reason backward from these environing facts and conditions and find Thomas Carlyle, Q. E. D. It is the nature of personality to escape analysis, to defy demonstration. And precisely because a literary personality attracts us so illogically, holds us by such intangible though unbreakable bonds, appeals to our subtlest social instincts,—it illustrates even better than a literary type, the sphere of fashions in literature. Open again the files of the college magazine, not now in search of the reigning hero of college fiction, but to examine the earnest pale-browed undergraduate's essay of half a century ago. You will find yourself suddenly engulfed in Carlylese. Carlyle was the fashion then, as Byron had been the fashion thirty years before, and the Carlylean profundities and storm-swept periods and upper-case type sat as queerly upon our fathers as did the Byronic melancholy upon our grandfathers. But how much they enjoyed it! And how much good it did them! This epidemic of Carlyleism is a legitimate part of the influence of Carlyle. For people do not choose books, or ideals, or leaders upon a cool philosophical balancing of reasons pro and con. They are swayed by prejudice, swept off their feet by infectious enthusiasm. They play the new game, follow the new cult, until they weary of it. But by that time it has done its wholesome work.

And let me hasten to add that such fashions as the rage of

Carlyle and Browning are good fashions. It was worth while to conform to them. Making every allowance for eccentricity and faddism among the followers of giants such as these there remains a positive gain of strenuous thinking and generous feeling. It is much better to lose one's way in the unparsed depths of Browning's *Sordello* than not to have any literary enthusiasms at all. It would be better for the educated young men and young women of the present year to be caught up into the seventh heaven of Transcendentalism with Carlyle or Emerson and to make themselves a little ridiculous if need be, rather than to be without illusions:—or to be under the spell of that worst and most dangerous of contemporary illusions, that which glorifies a barbaric pride of success and fatness of purse and skilful use of material resources, and which, so far from letting the ape and tiger within us die, boldly whistles to the brute within us, and pats him on the head and calls him a "good dog."

Now the brutality or the spirituality of any one author is contagious. It becomes possible to trace the fashions set by a single writer as they pass over into the more general fashions established by a school or group of authors. Walter Bagehot has pointed out in one of his political essays,—*Physics and Politics*,—that the style of a period becomes fixed in much the same way as the style of a newspaper or other periodical. In a newspaper certain views get expressed in a certain way. It is found to be an effective way. All the writers for that paper fall into it unconsciously. If contributions from outsiders do not conform to the character of the journal, they are either not admitted, or they are edited into accordance with the general vocabulary and rhetoric of that paper. This is more true, perhaps, of English journalism than of our own, though it often seems as if a thoroughly well-edited paper, like the *New York Sun*, were written throughout by the same man.

Our own American literature, perhaps fortunately, has known little of the sway of the fashionable clique, of the styles adopted by a literary center. Poe's attack upon literary coteries (in *The Literati* and other essays) was a Don Quixote charge against a wind mill of his own devising.

There are no literary conspiracies against the suburban or rural author, no "ring" to be feared or courted. Even the New England school of authors, who for forty years rightfully led our literature, were bound by no such ties of mutual intimacy as is often believed. The charge that these men in the past, or similar groups of men in New York or elsewhere, in the present, can set the fashion to the detriment of the obscure and struggling provincial genius, is a delightful myth, but a myth none the less.

Let me try to sum up definitely the value of this study of literary fashions. It aids, first, our sense of proportion as we face the confused and ever multiplying mass of readable books. It gives us perspective. We do not get a fair impression of the literary significance of Robert Elsmere in measuring it by the fact that in 1888 every clergyman was taking it as the text of his Sunday evening discourse. And it is equally unfair to test the value of the book by the fact that in 1889 copies of Robert Elsmere were marked down to ten cents—with no purchasers. But take these two facts together, and in the way Robert Elsmere or Janice Meredith or Richard Carvel or *The Virginian* came in and went out, as we say of hats or sleeves, you can discover not only certain characteristics of the American public, but some indication of the permanent literary rank of the book. It is the mean tide that measures these things, not the flood or the ebb. Shakespeare was neither the savage that Voltaire thought him, nor the angel that Mary Cowden Clarke would fain believe him. There will always be temporary aberrations in the public taste, but if there were no aberrations we should not appreciate so well its normal state of sanity. More copies of Peck's *Bad Boy*, it is said, were sold in a single year than of Emerson's *Essays* in sixty years, but that fact has nothing to do with the relative literary rank of Emerson and Peck.

And, secondly, and I suppose because it ministers to one's sense of proportion, a scrutiny of literary fashions is an un-failing resource for one's sense of humor. The comedies of the literary life are more numerous than its tragedies. For one Chatterton who perishes through pride and neglect, there are a dozen charlatans who grow fat through conceit and

favor. When we are inclined to wax melancholy over the fate of some book that failed to be read, there is always comfort—though perhaps of a rather cynical kind—in thinking of the sort of books that have succeeded. A picture on the cover, a pleasing shape, a new binding, a striking color, an effective title, publication in February rather than in January or March, a commendatory postal card from Mr. Gladstone,—such are some of the accidents to which books have apparently owed their fortune.

And finally, this scrutiny of literary fashions teaches, more effectively than some more pretentious studies, the permanent value of real worth. Sincerity, manliness, spirituality tell, in whatever guise. They cannot be disguised. Daniel Webster looks grand, whether sculptured in a Roman toga or in the American trousers of the year 1840. Genuine poetry touches the heart, whether bound in the gilt annual or keepsake of 1850, or printed in a ten cent magazine of 1904. The images of those we love are no less dear to us because the family photograph presents them to us in stocks and flowered waistcoats, or earrings and crinoline. Those passing styles do not hide the real man or the real woman, and beneath every popular applause or censure there abides the real book. As Thomas Carlyle passed them, "W'at an 'at!" cried one English workingman to another. "Ay," said the other, "but w'at an 'ead in the 'at!" Let us penetrate to the essentials. It is silly to worship the old-fashioned book because it is old; it is more silly still to devour the new book simply because it is new. Make fashions serve you, instead of you serving the fashions. Notice them. Conform to them if you think best. Often it will be best. But do not be preoccupied with them. "There is but one way of wearing a beautiful gown," said Madame de Girardin,—“and that is—to forget it!”

I remember an art collector pointed out to me with a touch of cynical amusement, a Greek statuette that adorned his library. He had been collecting critical opinions about it from the time of its discovery a century or two ago down to the present hour. Each generation of connoisseurs, he declared, had seen in that statuette precisely the qualities then held to be supremely important in a work of art. The roman-

ticists had found it naively romantic, the realists had pronounced it nobly realistic, the technicians had considered it a tour-de-force of technique. And there stood the statuette, generation after generation, incommunicable and unconcerned, calmly smiling at the changing fashions of the critics. But they all had found it beautiful; that redeems the story from the taint of cynicism. It may serve as a closing moral for this wandering talk about literature. Let us not forget to admire the great books; we shall admire them, no doubt, after the fashion prevailing in our own day; but through whatever spectacles of custom we may gaze, there will always be beauty there, serene, tranquil, imperishable.

Education in a Democracy*

BY HON. JOSEPH W. FOLK,
Governor of Missouri

We have come from Missouri here to the Conference for Education in the South, not that Missouri needs help, but because we want to do all that we can to advance the cause of education. The republic rests on education. The perpetuity of a republican form of government depends upon the intelligence of the masses. Imagine, if you please, every university in the land closed, every school-house shut, every teacher's lips sealed, and all education stopped; it would not be long before the result would be chaos, anarchy, barbarism; and as an entire lack of education in the masses must bring disaster, so on the other hand, the more the masses can be educated, the greater the blessing to governmental welfare and individual happiness. The children of today will be the sovereigns of the nation of tomorrow, and as the State has the right in order to protect society, to punish crime, so the State has the right to demand the education of the children who will be the future citizens of the State.

There has been a great deal of prejudice against compulsory educational laws. This prejudice, I am glad to say, is rapidly passing away. It used to be urged that the State had no right to go into a man's home and take his child and educate it without his consent; but we now realize that it is better for the State to take the child, even without the consent of the parent, and educate it, and make a useful citizen out of it, than to let it remain in ignorance, and grow up in crime. The penal institutions of the land are filled with the ignorant and the uneducated. Statistics show that ignorance and crime go hand in hand. For every dollar a State spends in the cause of education it gets back ten in lessened criminal costs, in better morals and in higher citizenship. We need more compulsory education laws in all of the Southern

*An address delivered at the Conference for Education in the South, Lexington, Ky., May, 1906. It is now printed in full for the first time.

States. Missouri passed such a law last year, and the results have been most beneficial; but there is one defect in our law, and the same can be said of the statutes of nearly every other State, and that is the provision that permits a child of indigent parents,—the sole support of the indigent parents,—to be exempt from school attendance, and allowed to labor. I made an investigation recently of the workings of this law, and visited some of the great factories of the city of St. Louis. I found many instances of little children,—little boys and girls of eight, nine and ten years of age,—working in these factories. In every instance it was claimed that the child was the sole support of an indigent parent. Experience has demonstrated that claims like these in the majority of instances are not *bona fide*, and arise rather from parental avarice, than from parental necessity. However that may be, I say that if a parent is so poor that he must rely for support upon the labor of an infant child, he is poor enough for the State to support him as a pauper. He should not be allowed to ruin the child physically, morally and mentally, as is the case when children are allowed to labor at the tender years of seven, eight or nine years.

This is a subject of especial importance to the Southern States because the wonderful industrial development of the past few years has caused factories to spring up on every hand. Too often these factories are run with child labor; and strange to say, most of that child labor is white. Child labor is the enemy of education and of civilization. If this Conference shall succeed in arousing a public sentiment against this abuse, and in favor of more compulsory education, its labors will be of untold benefit to countless millions.

Not only do we need more compulsory education laws of wider application, but we need more attention to the education of the many, instead of devoting nearly all of our energies to the education of the few. Nearly every State spends ten dollars per scholar to educate students in higher education where one is spent to lay the foundation of an education in the common schools. This is like putting a million dollar dome on a thousand dollar house. It is well enough for men of wealth to endow great universities for the higher educa-

tion of the few, but it would be better if some of these millions were expended on the common schools for the common education of the many. It is a commendable thing to give libraries to cities and towns, but if some of the millions going towards libraries were given to the cause of the education of the masses through the common schools of the country, the public benefit would be much greater. Let the masses be educated and libraries will spring up on every hand, and they will not have to be donated. Let the masses be ignorant and the costliest library buildings will be mere ornaments, and the rarest books will molder in disuse.

We need universities, we need libraries, but we should not forget that these are not all that we need, and we should not cause these to make us neglect the education of the masses in the common schools. It is more important that all of the people have some education, than that some of the people have all of the education. Every State needs more school houses, better equipment, better paid teachers, and better teachers. No school is better than the teacher makes it, nor worse than the teacher permits it to become. The future citizens of our country are made good or bad in the common schools, long before they reach the universities, if they go there at all. There has been a great deal of discussion as to the relative value of the university and the common schools. The great universities, it seems to me, are too prone merely to educate the head, while the smaller colleges and the common schools educate the heart as well as the head. We need to educate the head to make men brilliant, and the hands to make men useful, and the heart to make men true and patriotic.

In foreign lands ruled by kings and emperors, a child who is destined to be a king is educated with special reference to the duties of sovereignty that will devolve upon him in after years. We too often forget that with us every child will be a sovereign, and so too little attention is paid to instilling into the minds and hearts of the youth of the land the sacred duties of sovereignty in a free country, where every man is a king. We need to teach in the schools more patriotism. Nineteen hundred years ago the religion of the world had

become a thing of idle form and ceremony; it was a religion of the head and not of the heart. Then came the teachings of the man of Galilee and gave to religion a beating heart. So patriotism had become merely a word, but we now realize that there may be just as much patriotism in giving one's time to the betterment of civic conditions, in getting good men in office as in baring one's breast to the bullets of the public enemy in times of war.

Some three and a half years ago there was held in one of our cities a banquet attended by a number of business men. After the repast was over the band played "America," and the audience stood and sang the familiar words. As the last strains of that song died away, one of the men present, with tears of patriotic delight trickling down his cheeks, turned to his neighbor and said "Oh, that I could die for my country!" Just three weeks after that, that same man was humbly kneeling at the feet of justice confessing that he had bribed an entire municipal assembly to pass a franchise bill. He was willing, he said, to be a patriot of war, but his record had shown that he was unwilling to be a patriot of peace. He had patriotism on his lips, and he had treason in his heart. That man was but a type. Many men will give up their lives, if need be, on the field of battle for their country; and patriotism of that kind cannot be too highly commended. But the man who will live for his city, his State and his nation every day, is the man that the republic needs just now.

There is a patriotism of peace as well as a patriotism of war; and history tells us that where one government has been destroyed by wars and pestilences and all other calamities combined, corruption in times of peace has undermined a score. How can I live for my country? the child may ask. There never was a time when men and women were needed in public affairs more than now. We need more men in public affairs influenced alone by the public good, and fewer of those who are in politics merely for revenue. I do not refer to the need of men in public office alone, for it should not be forgotten that one does not have to hold public office in order to serve his country. Mr. Ogden here, does not, I think, hold a public office, and yet there are few men in this country doing

their country more service than he is doing. When good citizens disregard their obligations, they leave control to another element, and this element demands of those elected to office that they be served even if the public interests suffer; and if an official refuses to prosecute his trust, he is put under the ban of their disapproval and thereafter disbarred from holding office, that is, if the gang has its way about it, and it usually does; but once in a while the whirlwind of public opinion sweeps it aside for a time.

The people of St. Louis showed that,—showed that while the strength of the lawless element may be great, it is as nothing when it comes in conflict with an aroused public conscience. They rose up and overthrew the corruptionists. Philadelphia at last awoke from her slumbers, and determined to do something, and though the gang was strong there it has been shattered beneath the shafts of public opinion under the leadership of Mayor Weaver of that city. What was done in these cities, and I might mention others, can be done anywhere, for wherever you may go, whether it be in the greatest city in all the land or in the smallest hamlet, you will find that the good people are in the majority. They are usually quiet though, while the other set are so vociferous as to deceive many as to their number. A dozen law-breakers can make more noise than five hundred law-abiding citizens; but they do not count for much against the united efforts of the law-abiding. It is hard to get the law-abiding to be united.

What should be taught in every school should be respect for the law. Every child should know that its State consists not of its fields and forests, not of the mountains of precious metals nor of splendid cities, but of laws. Take away the laws from Kentucky or Missouri, and there would be no State governments left; and just in proportion as any of these laws are ignored the government is weakened to that extent. A law that is not enforced adds just as much to the strength of government as sores to the strength of the human body. When one law is not enforced then other laws must be disregarded, and then contempt for all law is bred. What we need in this republic is more respect for existing laws rather

than more laws. It is a good deal easier to have good people go to the legislature and get good laws enacted, than it is to get good laws enforced. The corporation magnate should be compelled to respect the law that regulates the conduct of the corporation, as he asks others to respect the law that protects the property of the corporation. The anarchy of capital breeding lawlessness should no more be tolerated than the anarchy of labor breeding riot and disorder. Men should learn that the unjustifiable and wilful killing of a human being is murder, whether it is done by an individual or in a mob of a thousand.

The dram-shop keeper should be compelled to respect the law that says his saloon shall close on Sunday. It used to be said that the gambling laws, the wine room acts, and Sunday dram-shop statutes could not be enforced in the great cities of the land. But I say to you that those laws are enforced, and enforced to the letter, in the great cities of St. Louis, Kansas City, and St. Joseph, Missouri, and they will continue to be enforced as long as I am governor of Missouri. The governor there has the power, because he appoints the police boards, and in St. Louis, the excise commissioner. The situation in this State and in many other States is very different. Since these laws have been enforced in these cities, the actual statistics show that crime has been reduced in St. Louis and Kansas City,—that is Sunday crime—by 45 per cent. The business of the butcher, the baker, and the small merchant has increased during that time enormously. Many and many a mother, many and many a wife, and many and many a daughter has written me that since these laws were enforced they now have something to eat and to wear on Sundays and Mondays, whereas before they had nothing at all. I say to you that one such letter from one good woman more than compensates for the curses of ten thousand outlaw liquor dealers.

To secure respect for law—and you can only get this by educating the public conscience—educate the child; let it be talked on the street corner, in the school and in the home. Did you know that four years ago the law against bribery was not considered a very serious thing? Many men considered bribery merely a conventional offense, and when the

prosecutions were started in St. Louis, members of the House of Delegates denounced the bribery statute as a blue law; but I have observed that any law looks blue to a man when he wants to break it. Why, four years ago men would give bribes and think nothing of it. Men would take bribes and boast of it. Legislative halls were made dens of thieves, and the touch of the unclean dollar was over all. Finally the people were awake to a realization of the fact that bribery is treason, the treason of peace, and then came a firm determination to stamp out the offense that strikes at the heart of free government. But four years ago, why, men would give bribes and take bribes and still consider themselves honest. I will tell you a story just here from real life to illustrate that: A member of the Municipal Assembly of St. Louis accepted a bribe of \$25,000 to vote against a franchise bill. Then he accepted a bribe of \$50,000 to vote in favor of it from the other side. He sat down and he sent the \$25,000 that he had received to vote against the franchise back to the man who had given it to him with a little note saying, "I send you the money that you paid me to vote against that franchise bill because I do not feel, after considering the matter thoroughly, that I can honestly earn that money."

And another along the same line that may illustrate it better, that is, the condition of the public mind four years ago: A state senator sold his vote for \$500. He got the money, put it in his pocketbook, put the pocketbook in the inside pocket of his coat. That night he had to take the train and go to his home in a distant part of the State. He took his coat with the pocketbook with the money inside, and laid it in the upper berth of the Pullman where he had taken a berth. When he got up the next morning, he found his pocketbook was gone. He suspected the porter, and had that person brought before him and charged with the larceny. The porter became frightened and confessed, and handed the senator the pocketbook containing the \$500 bribe money. The senator drew himself up to his full height and said, "My man, I could send you to the penitentiary for this, but I will not do that. Instead, I will give you a little advice. Remember, wherever you are, under any and all circumstances, that

honesty is the best policy!" It did not occur to him that he had committed a worse offense than the porter when he sold the vote that did not belong to him, but to his constituents. But they have learned better than that now. The public conscience has been educated to viewing the crime of bribery in its true light. The energies of this public conscience have been extended from the domain of the public wrong-doer to that of the private wrong-doer, and probing into the activities of rascals of every kind. Why, some of our great insurance companies were found to be manipulating things for the advantage of some of the directors. Now, they may not have thought that they were doing wrong at first. Lots of these men out in the House of Delegates did not think they were doing wrong when they took the bribe money, but some of these directors are now learning that great lesson. The public conscience is demanding now a higher standard in official life; it is demanding a higher standard of honesty in private life; and that public conscience will continue to make a standard, new yet old, applicable to every act, whether it be of a public official or a private citizen,—a standard of common, simple honesty, that is all.

The world is not getting worse; but these very exposures, the very awakening of the public conscience, shows that the world is getting better. These things do not indicate a moral degeneration, but they show a moral regeneration. Wealth is not worshiped with the same devotion today that it used to be; and gold is not regarded with the same awe as of old. The effort is now to get right more than it is to get rich, to get right and to stay right. There is a constant conflict between the forces of evil and good, of right and wrong, of the law and the lawless, of education and ignorance. In every sphere of life, the right, the true, the law, education, must always be fought for. The wrong, the lawless, ignorance, must always be fought against. It is not enough to be merely against wrong. You must be actively against it if your influence counts. The farmer must not only sow the useful grain, but he must care for it and nurture it, while the briars and thistles sown by accident, cared for by chance, will flourish anywhere. So a field neglected will not grow up in

useful grain, but in briars and thistles. A child neglected will not become good of his own accord, or educated, but he will become bad and ignorant and to make the child good and educated it takes the activity, it takes the energy of someone. And in taking up that work this Conference is doing more for humanity and for American citizenship than any one influence in our public life today.

Now, these things may be ideal, but ideas and ideals are the life of a free people. We are made and governed by the things that we cherish. The public life of a nation or a State is but the reflection of its private life, and no government is better than the majority of its voters. Rome built great highways and founded mighty cities while Roman civilization was declining. She erected barriers against the barbarous hordes that surged against her from without while the strength of Roman character ebbed away; and when that was gone there was nothing to defend, there was nothing to conquer.

There is an old story of an eastern king who caused a great palace to be erected as the abode of majesty and of power. Stone by stone the structure grew, and the heart of the king swelled with pride. One morning the palace was in ruins. "What great treason hath been accomplished here?", the king exclaimed; and a price was put upon the head of the traitor who had destroyed the abode of majesty. But a wise man of the court thus admonished the king: "Great master, there has been no treason here. Thy house that was great and mighty has fallen down because the builders used mortar without sand. Hence their work has come to ruin." So with the State, external grandeur counts for nothing. We may calculate our wealth as the sands of the sea, we may build the domes of our capitol and the spires of our churches until they pierce the clouds and glitter amongst the stars: all must fall and crumble away unless it be welded and strengthened by those principles of Christian education that constitute the ground work of an enlightened citizenship.

So, we of Missouri want to help along in this movement. The patriotism of the South in solving all of these great problems is just the same as the patriotism of the North. There is now but one heart in all,—North, East, South and

West—and that is the heart of America. Here, between the two great oceans, on ground consecrated by the blood of patriots to the principles of liberty and self-government, we have founded an empire such as no conqueror of old ever dreamed of. But the greatness of a nation does not consist in mere acreage of territory, nor in the strength of battle-ships, but in the purity of its ideals and in the intensity of its devotion to those principles that make for right, for justice, and for education throughout the world. True to these principles, and with the masses educated, we shall be the most powerful among all the nations of the earth; but forsaking these, our strongest military engines will become as toys in our hands, and our proudest naval armaments will be as impotent as the armies and navy of Russia against the victorious Japanese. In the opera, Siegfried is represented as seated at the mouth of a cavern. Birds are singing, leaves are rustling, and light is shimmering about him. Yet he cannot understand what the sounds mean. At length comes the revelation of song, and of life; and the hero passes swiftly up the heights where, encircled in flame, sleeps the soul of his strength. So, in some other day, when we shall have struck to the heart that ignorance that is the real foe of progress, not only in the South but all over the nation, the heights of achievement will be climbed, and we shall stand face to face with the ideal and the true.

The Achievement of a Generation*

By EDWIN A. ALDERMAN,

President of the University of Virginia

For five years I have been associated with the work of the Conference for Education in the South, and for me it has been a noble and inspiring association. During these five years I have never lost sight for one moment of the reasons for the existence of this conference. This conference is, and always has been, simply a unique association of Americans of all professions and classes and sections, working together in a spirit of brotherhood, to bring to pass one of the nicest and most difficult achievements of any democracy,—the establishment and maintenance of an adequate system of training for all the workers and citizens of a republic saturated with the idea, if somewhat out of plumb in the practice, of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. This conference has contributed, I dare to claim tonight, to the better life of this nation, the new and fruitful idea of voluntary civic co-operation, and in its greatest and directest offsprings, the Southern Education Board, and the General Education Board, and the State Co-operative Associations, has given to this idea a form and a method that increases the directive power of democracy in a simple and natural way. The Southern man is so often thought of as a sort of ambassador from one court of public opinion to another, that I sometimes hesitate to speak of the South as distinct from other sections, for, perhaps, we do dwell on this too much. But this is a Conference for Education in the South, and therefore, I am justified in presenting the peculiar problems of the South. The Southern States of our nation were not chosen as the immediate and transient objective of the work of this Conference because of any doubt as to the ability of the South to build its institutions in strength and in completeness, or to take its position as the equal, and in some respects, the leader

*An address delivered at the Conference for Education in the South, Lexington, Ky., May 4, 1906.

of any other section in this republic. Any understanding of this movement which does not understand it as a national movement misses the secret of the whole idea. If there be any man or any woman in this great audience tonight who does not understand the movement for which this Conference stands as a great national movement, I repeat that he is missing the heart of the whole matter. The spirit back of it is continually tending, indeed, to express itself more and more in a national rather than in a Southern objective. The original choice of the Southern States as the temporary theatre of effort was made for these seven good reasons:

First—The free public school in its best form was not possible in the South during its years of isolation and submersion, when family instead of community life was the unit, when individualism controlled society and slavery obstructed communal effort. This was the golden age of the private academy, and in such academies the South in the middle of last century probably excelled the rest of this nation, and was equaled, perhaps only by Scotland.

Second—The South was rural and was sparsely settled, which are the most difficult social conditions for the spread of public schools.

Third—The South was bi-racial, involving a duplication of educational effort and a conquest of racial difficulties.

Fourth—The South was the over-burdened section of America. No other Americans have ever known in its direst and completest form, the discipline of war and defeat. No other region among the great culture nations of the world ever lost in one decade, over one-tenth of its population, and three and a half billions of its wealth, the form of its society, and the genius of its life, save a certain unconquerable steadfastness, resiliency, courage and self-reliance.

Fifth—The South was passing with amazing rapidity and power of adjustment from an agricultural order, depressed by poverty and misrule, to an industrial democracy wherein it must regain its national feeling in a country itself attaining a sense of national solidarity which it had not known since 1820.

Sixth—The character of the citizenship of the South, both

the unexploited and the backward elements, and the old sturdy stocks sobered by woe and strengthened by fortitude, promised the richest results in character and efficiency to the nation at large.

Seventh—There existed in the South an untaught and backward race, newly projected from slavery into citizenship and economic responsibility.

The time has come for us, I think, to take stock of what has been settled out of all this striving, not so much by the merely auxiliary forces of this conference, but by the splendid, patient forces generated in the South, and at work in the South since 1875,—the very first moment Southern citizenship could get at this task out of the anarchy of war. It is well for men and women, who are engaged in any work of social amelioration, to look their task in the face often, and to appraise its nature soberly, lest they fall into fixed ways of doing things no longer needful to be done, and of firing bravely away at things that have passed the firing line; lest, in short, the whole thing become static and cease to move at all. I know of no movement, in modern times founded in a higher purpose, carried forward with steadier zeal, and with greater results to its credit than what I might call the educational battle of the South since the year 1870. The men and women who have carried it forward deserve well the praise of their fellows and of posterity. Their task was to build a public spirit and to create a constructive talent in an individualistic, conservative and aristocratic form of society, smitten by war and unjust debts, for a communal, collective, democratic institution, costing vast sums and a world of skill and patience. The movement may be said to have begun, and I like somehow to think that it began, when General Lee decided not to become the president of an insurance company, and became the president of Washington College. This simple and sincere act crowns beautifully, in my thought, the large, spacious life of that large, sincere man. It had passed beyond all failure, when our brethren, many of whom are here tonight, North, East and West, blessed with social sympathy of rare quality, came to ask the privilege of co-operation with us. It was a worthy impulse of theirs to offer, and

it was a worthy impulse of ours to accept such co-operation. We cannot see to the end, for there is no end to any work of social amelioration, but I shall claim tonight that some fundamental things have been settled, in this civic battle of thirty odd years, whether wisely or unwisely I shall not discuss, and that some fundamental things remain unsettled, and it is my chief purpose to enquire what these settled and unsettled things are and to isolate some of them for your criticism and study.

It has been settled that the chief business of a democratic State is to educate its children at the common cost, the property of all the State contributing its share for this purpose.

It has been settled that the benefits of the public schools shall be open to all, regardless of class, sect, or race, provided that the children of the white and black races shall be taught in separate schools.

It has been settled as a necessity of democratic education that further class distinctions in education shall not enter in the public schools so as to modify the curriculum, the methods, or the discipline. This means that in the public schools, the son of the banker and the son of the artisan shall study the same subjects, in the same fashion, and get the same democratic impulses and sympathies. It has been settled that it is a moral and economic error of the first magnitude to neglect the education of any of the people, and an economic necessity of the first magnitude to develop the productive power of trained intelligence. It has been demonstrated that while the public schools do not infringe upon religious liberty, their instruction does not make for godlessness or irreligion. It has been settled that education is the abstract right of the child and not an act of public benevolence or even of public sagacity. There may be those who still cling to the ancient fear of the danger that may lurk in the education of the masses, but they now lack the courage to give to that fear the dignity of public utterance. It would seem to be settled, and I believe it to be settled as a matter of State policy at least, that the proposition to distribute school funds raised by taxation to the two races on the basis of the amount contributed by each, is un-democratic, un-economic and un-American.

The education of the country child and the general enrichment of rural life—and by enrichment I mean making the country a sweeter and happier place to live in, to remove its isolation and loneliness by libraries, by good roads, by telephones, by touch with the great throbbing world—are now accepted without dispute as fundamental tenets of public education.

There never was a time when children bulked so large in the thought of the statesman, the legislator and the publicist, and I might add in the family, and never in the history of the world has the child been the focus of so much tenderness, and so much forethought. I believe men and women love their children better; I believe they have learned how to love and serve them more wisely. There are those that fear that all this fine solicitude may affect childhood and destroy its ingenuousness and its charm. I do not fear that, though I confess that it is getting increasingly difficult for parents to give satisfaction to their children. But I suppose we shall have to accept that. It imposes an obligation of perfection upon paternity and maternity that probably the Lord intended should be put upon them in the fullness of time.

In the General Assembly of the State of Virginia for 1906, fifty-two bills were introduced touching childhood at some angle; one-half of the debate of that body was in the interest of childhood; \$930,000 was directly appropriated out of the treasury for the welfare of childhood. I wish some one with more time than I have, could collate similar facts in the other Southern States, and compare the results for the year 1896. The summary, I predict, would establish the fact that progress is measured by the distance one has travelled as well as by the point one has reached, and that the South has made up its mind to persevere, without haste and without pause, until its children have as good a chance for training as the children of any other section of this republic. I have watched this battle since young manhood with patience. The youthful reformer wants things to happen, you know, but they do not happen as soon as he wants them to happen. He is in the attitude of the man who fell off a high bridge, and said, "Lord have mercy on me, and have it quick." But the sea-

soned and veteran reformer, learns to await the slow processes of time.

It is accepted that the public schools are now subject to the legislative power in each State, because they are supported by taxation, and the power of taxation is a sovereign power which can be exercised only by the legislature. Therefore, we see everywhere increasing legislative and executive control over the schools. Increasing executive control is perhaps necessary in the moment of transition from any sort of weakness to strength, but the local interest in the school must grow so strong that the legislative power will finally touch only what is general and vital, while the real heartening and directing power shall be local. It is just now very interesting to compare the popular emphasis everywhere placed on local taxation, and the vast working results that are coming out of the campaigns for local taxation, with the increasing development of executive control. There never was a time when the State superintendents of public education had as much opportunity, if they are possessed of originality, power, purpose and will, to impress themselves upon the life of their States. They are the architects in a sense unrealized by their predecessors of the fortunes of their commonwealths.

It has been settled, I believe, that the South is hereafter to place its chief emphasis upon community effort, rather than upon individualism. It has been settled that the South has recognized forever that civilization may express itself in terms of wealth and energy as well as in terms of loyalty, sentiment and enthusiasm. The spectacular recuperative power of the South, and the eager,—I might almost say joyous,—mastery of modern industrial forces, gives to its rebuilding period the same aspects of steadiness and of grandeur that surrounded the period of its suffering and its losses. Six thousand new industrial enterprises were started in the South last year. The South has always feared the power of money, and I know of no more popular thing in many audiences than to speak of money disparagingly. There is a fine moral basis for this fear, but there is a great deal of unthinking talk on the whole subject. Money has its good points. Sometimes when I have heard a man preaching against the

evils of money to an audience that I knew had about an average of thirty-seven and a half cents in its collective pocket, I felt that it was a sheer wast of hortatory effort for the hearers were in no immediate danger of the perils of money. They rather needed to be told how to create wealth, and how to use wealth for the development of society. Nothing pleases me more than to see this power to produce wealth coming as a fixed habit into our life. Down in Mississippi some years ago I asked an old fellow to change a five dollar bill for me, and he said, "Stranger, a bull yearling is legal tender for five dollars in this community." Now the deposits in the Mississippi savings banks have increased three hundred per cent, and they believe in the gold standard. This transition from the bull-yearling standard to the gold standard in a few years is a wonderful example of financial growth.

And yet in spite of the fact that the South has entered thus powerfully into its industrial maturity, I hope it is not provincialism in me to believe that the southern boy, as I see him, has not been submerged by it. As he reaches up into life, facing tardily the grandeurs and the temptations of a fierce industrialism and a wonderful democracy, I believe that it is settled that he will not lose his old inherited scorn of dishonor, and his old hatred of sordidness, assurance and self-seeking. This may be provincialism, but let us believe it anyhow, and let us tell the boys we believe it, and maybe it will help them to stand firm when mighty temptations come, and they are coming very fast. The ambitions of our boys are drifting away from what used to be their chief desires—from the thought of civic glory to the thought of attainment of power in the great world of industrial achievement. This impulse is strikingly illustrated by the decay of the literary society in the colleges. There is no use to whimper about it; there is no use to be pessimistic about it; we must face it and give it right direction, and establish right character, and let the world go on.

It is settled that there shall be no organic relation between the church and the State, and yet there is, after a sad period of confusion and difference, a gratifying unity of purpose on the part of both church and State to build up an adequate

school system, free from sectarianism and partisan bias. That result is dear to me. The first newspaper war I ever had was with a dear good old preacher, who has now gone to his reward. He said that the public schools were godless, and I said, with a good deal of immature warmth, that they were not, and I think I was right and I believe he does, too, somewhere upon some mount of faith in the spirit land.

It is plain, though not entirely settled, that the public will not be satisfied until there shall be established a public high school within reasonable distance at least of every white child. Let us give thanks for this growing appreciation of the absolute need of the high school as a necessary nexus between the different parts of our educational system. There is an organized attempt in Virginia, for instance, to secure a universal and organic high school system, rather than to establish here and there isolated high schools. Already 100 applications have come in from the counties for the subsidies that the State gives to encourage that movement.

It is settled, I believe, that there shall be a university practically free in every State. The original decision as to the university is the act of our forefathers,—and in some instances our colonial forefathers, but their resuscitation, their new direction is fairly the work of that heroic body of men who gave their youth to war, and who have given their old age to peace. And it is settled that there shall be at least one normal school for each race, for the scientific training of teachers, practically free in every Southern State. These normal schools are rapidly becoming more numerous.

It is settled, through the far-seeing wisdom of the United States Government, and partly through a growing appreciation of our own citizenship, hitherto uninterested in liberal arts, in agricultural and technical instruction, that there shall be at least one technical college for each race in each State. This conception has not yet won such universal acceptance as to have fixed agricultural, mechanical and domestic training in the curriculum of general school life, but it is tolerably clear that this instruction will never be satisfactorily digested in the colleges until it permeates the whole field of elementary and secondary education.

This is the sum of the things that I think have been settled. It is a wonderful total for the strivings of a quarter of a century, and yet we should remember that many of them have been settled only in the court of public opinion, and in the arena of public debate. To translate them into familiar realities, visible, tangible and dynamic, is the task we stand in front of tonight. It is a great, solemn task.

The following fundamental things,—and I ask your criticism of them,—I submit them to you with timidity,—seem to be fairly unsettled, and deserve your thought, and the thought of every earnest man and woman.

First, there does not yet exist a true understanding of the unity of the educational process. It is not clearly comprehended that education is one thing and not many things, that it is not elementary and then secondary, and then higher and then still higher, and each phase marked off by a distinct wall of separation, but *one* thing, as one as life, as one as the air, as one as the sunlight. Higher education means just more education.

There does not exist a clear understanding of the inter-relations between the public schools and the private schools, and the State colleges and those that depend upon private beneficence and religious zeal. The whole inter-relation of higher education is not truly and wisely adjusted. Too often the different stages of education are made to stand over against each other, as if hostile to each other, with their separate countersigns, war-cries and camps as if they were hostile things, existing for individual glory and individual greatness. It is as absurd for them to be hostile to each other as it would be for lighthouses to be hostile to each other, situated at different angles along a bleak and stormy shore. Each phase of the great process is thought of as an isolated unit, as a separate atom, rather than as a different stage of an organic and related process. Raw unsocial individualism still works its will,—I had almost said, its wicked will, in this field. This is what I mean by "raw individualism." I once knew a little town that had an ambition for a public library. That was in the pre-Carnegian era, and this is the way the town went at the job: The different little organiza-

tions that wanted to do good in the community started little efforts to do good for the library. Little Do Good Societies had strawberry festivals and raised \$8.30, "The Bright Jewels" did something and raised something, and the Sons and Daughters of almost everything that you can think of made efforts and raised somewhere between seven and thirteen dollars. Perhaps the Young Men's Christian Association, standing upon its vantage ground, invited public gifts of books. People sent them books freely, and *such books*,—Patent Office Reports, lives of people who ought never to have lived their lives, much less had them written. The community had all the sanitary advantages of a spring cleaning accompanied by the impulse of philanthropy, and the whole thing "petered out" in pathetic inefficiency. That I call "raw individualism." That same town today,—let us thank God for the communal spirit that has entered there, as well as for the colossal beneficence of Andrew Carnegie, which has stimulated this communal spirit, is preparing with joy and with spirit to tax itself to support, establish and maintain a great building that will stand on some central spot, a thing of beauty to charm the spirit and touch the soul of every boy and girl, and the future mothers and fathers of every boy and girl in that community, and they are proud of themselves. That I call the genius of community effort, and that is the spirit we must introduce as a controlling impulse in our life.

There is not yet any adequate understanding of the relation of school life to the other activities of social life, nor of education as a great social factor modifying and affecting civilization as a whole. There is a little irony that this is not so,—for I believe that Thomas Jefferson was the first American who conceived of education as a great means of influencing and establishing national character. Education had been thought of as a thing to make people good, to make them into good preachers, good listeners to sermons and efficient makers of a living, but Jefferson had a vision of it as a great elementary force, molding and chiselling and changing the ideals and the very form of national life and purpose. And the more one studies about Jefferson, the greater he will

grow. This inadequate understanding, let it be understood, is by no means confined to the South. Many of these unsettled things I am trying to talk about are nationally unsettled things,—just as unsettled in New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts and North Dakota as they are here in Kentucky, and perhaps in other States of the South.

We are passing swiftly from the period of propagandism in public education to the period of construction. The majestic force we call public opinion, will continually demand stimulation even on these settled things, for public opinion will not stay made up. It must be kept made up, and it must be re-made up for new ideas as they are brought before it; and therefore, there is work for this Conference in that direction. There will also always be work for the Educational Co-operative Associations for the different States. They should become permanent bodies, efficient organizations, to watch with eternal vigilance the state of public opinion. The greatest demand for the future, however, is to be not so much public agitation upon the question of whether or not public education is desired, as for sound basis of action, of intelligence in the scientific use of the moneys made possible by an aroused public opinion. In other words the character of our educational leader is about to shift from the stimulator to the builder; from the man who stirs the public conscience to the man who informs the public mind; from the man who pleads, to the man who enlightens, to the man who can go into a community and teach that community how to build a good schoolhouse, and how to order its curriculum in the interest of the child, for the use that life will demand of him; how to co-ordinate the school properly with the schools above it, and with the schools below it, and with life itself.

It is not well agreed that the parent who keeps his children away from school for other than unavoidable hindrances is guilty of a crime against the child and against the State. There are still too many who keep children home to pick cotton, or strawberries, or huckleberries, without thought of the injury and the violence that they are doing to them in their careers. I say this in entire sympathy with those who are forced by hard poverty to use the labor of their children.

Neither is it well agreed, notwithstanding much splendid growth in our normal schools and in professional spirit, that teaching is a profession, and that expert training is indispensable for the duties of the teacher's office. I had a very interesting afternoon today. I went out to one of these great farms and met an imposing aristocracy of horses. Their names will long linger with me,—Salvator, Monarch of the Turf, Water Color, Water Cress, Water Boy, Star Ruby and so on; I felt like taking off my hat and engaging them in conversation, and asking them questions, as they encircled our little company. When I was told that the life of one was insured for \$100,000 and that he had earned nearly \$200,000, I could hardly restrain the impulse to ask him to contribute to our endowment fund, for I know small villages whose productive power is but little greater. There was a certain emotion in thus facing the limit of horse achievement. There stood the horse who had done the greatest thing that horses can do. I thought of the breeding, the care and training, that had been given to those splendid creatures, who looked on us little humans with something of the fine scorn that Dean Swift must have had in mind when he conceived of his houghnhnms and his horse philosophers. I thought, I say, of the training and care that had been given to those splendid creatures and my mind went to that army of 375,000 children in this splendid State, among whom may be living today some Henry Clay, some Abraham Lincoln, some Jefferson Davis, some John C. Breckenridge, some little soul in whose mind may one day flash and burn a light of genius that will brighten the ways of this State and the people for generations to come. A new realization came to me that the child is the treasury of the Commonwealth, the jewel of the State, the hope of society.

There is no adequate understanding of the vastly increased compensation that must be paid to teachers before they can be erected into a body of men and women capable of rendering the service to the State that society demands of them. This is said in due recognition of the splendid services rendered by many of our teachers for inadequate remuneration. Dr. Charles D. McIver has made the point that the average

compensation paid to the average teacher, does not equal that paid to the street cleaner in the great cities. These questions are settled at teachers' meetings and school celebrations, but no man ever believes anything until he is willing to sacrifice something to make it a reality.

It has not been settled that economic waste in higher education shall be decreased or abolished by the unification of higher institutions of learning,—unification in purpose and spirit, and, frequently, in mere physical space. Educational institutions, as I have said, do not exist for their own glory; they do not exist for the fame of their faculties, for the sentimental satisfaction of their alumni. They exist in order to yield society continual returns of efficiency and power. It is painful to see how much wiser corporate and industrial life is in this respect than educational life. No great corporate concern in this world, in its single-minded fight for expansion, would permit for a moment the enormous waste that goes on in the realm of higher education through repetition and duplication of effort. If all the power in chemical laboratories of the higher institutions of Virginia could be put into one great chemical laboratory, that laboratory would be one of the headquarters for chemical study on the American continent, and the same remark is true of other States. The State is going to wake up to this thing before long and stop it, and demand that a proper return for its investment be made to the public welfare. In other words, the principle of consolidation must come into higher education as well as lower. Instead of atomism and raw individualism there will be unity and power for service to the whole State.

The question of just how much intelligent participation shall be used by the white man, individually and collectively, in the training of the negro for life in this republic, has not been settled, though a vast amount of earnest sympathy in his training has been and is now manifested by the Southern white man. Neither has it been settled in just what spirit the negro will receive this manifested interest and respond to its directive force and purpose. There has not been time for the settlement of such intricate situations. In the meantime, let us understand that we have barely attacked this

great problem, despite great expenditure, much legislation, experimentation and speculation. Mr. John Morley thinks it practically unsolvable, and perhaps it is, but we must continue to face it bravely, valiantly, resolutely, humanely. The increasing regular and voluntary attendance of negro children upon whatever public education is furnished them affords a somewhat pathetic but fine illustration of the faith of this backward race in the power of training to adjust them to the new demands of freedom. To illustrate, there are enrolled in the Southern schools 1,578,632 colored children, fifty-five per cent of all the educable colored children are enrolled; seventy-one per cent of all the white children are enrolled; sixty-two per cent of all enrolled colored children attend fairly regularly; and sixty-four per cent of all the white children enrolled attend fairly regularly.

It has been settled, I think, that the emphasis laid by the leaders of the negro race upon training in the industrial arts promises the best returns in the development of the capacities of that race as workers and as elements in civic life. The whole question is before us. Like most thoughtful men in the South, I have a real interest in the welfare and training of the negro, for whatever we may think of him,—and I am talking about Southern people who were reared with him,—as a political or social factor, we cannot deny to him humanity, personality or economic value. No amount of imagining, no amount of prophecy, not even an occasional nightmare can settle this question much in advance of the processes of slow time. Each phase of the great process of social adjustment will have its own particular group of dangers, difficulties and doubts. I preach neither optimism nor pessimism nor any doctrine or theory save only that we face a great human problem in ethics and economics, and ages to come will judge our quality by the wisdom we use.

Perhaps if we decided to discuss the negro less in the abstract,—we of the South,—and when we discuss him, use just a *little* more optimism about him, get him off our nerves, and decide to try to find the best contribution he can make to the strength of the nation; to consider him as an asset in short, and if our friends of the North in their discussions

could try persistently to get him out of their emotions, to think of him less fervidly and more with their strong practical brains, the whole problem might lose some of its irritating aspect. There is no denying the frightful difficulties that beset the relations of two people of such widely divergent types, who must forever live separately and yet side by side. But there is only one thing on God's earth to do with a human being, and that thing is to give him a chance. The real question is not, shall the negro be trained? Everything should be trained from Luther Burbank's vegetables and fruits out there in California, from these great horses that made me feel inferior this afternoon, to little human beings, whose possibilities God Almighty alone knows. The real question is, *how* shall the negro be trained? and the next question is, What part we of the South, we who know him best, who know his faults,—and he has grievous faults,—and who know his virtues,—and he has many solid virtues,—shall have in that training. And the largest question of all is the incorporation in our life on such a practical and democratic basis of wise and universal training that the most backward man of the most backward race cannot escape its benefits.

The increasing growth of Hampton Institute and Tuskegee are sociological facts of great importance furnishing further evidence of (a) the faith of the negro in education, (b) of his willingness to sacrifice to get education, (c) of the constructive ability of gifted leaders of his race, (d) of the sympathy of the white race in his advancement.

The attitude of the states toward the education of woman may fairly be described as in an unsettled condition, especially as their education is affected by the higher institutions of learning. The State has not yet announced its decision in this vital matter. I do not refer so much to co-education as to co-ordinate education. The advent of woman as a citizen, largely in pleading for this very movement of popular education is a very striking fact, and the most striking thing about that fact itself is the energy, the enthusiasm, the common sense, the patience and the power that women have brought to this cause. And I am not saying this just to be

pleasing to women. I love to be pleasing to women, every normal man does, but I have highly covenanted with myself not to speak mere gallantries to them—in public, at least. But this enthusiasm, this persistence, this devotion and service to a great cause must have its results. It is just not in mortal man to withstand it long. They will have to give way, and when men do decide to give way before the onslaught of the will and the purpose of women, they generally make an abject Waterloo of it. This is true at times even in the family life.

There is not an adequate understanding of the true relation of helpfulness, of guidance, and of support that a State university should maintain towards the State which has established and maintained it. No cry for guidance in its complex development should come up out of any American State, which is not met with immediate answer by its State university. Its duty is not alone to provide preachers and teachers and lawyers and doctors and clean hearted and clear minded men,—it is that of course,—but to provide as well experts in every phase of expansion in a complex new line, in engineering, in commerce, agriculture, the domestic arts, in public health, in public transportation, and public welfare generally. A State university must become the place that not only gains and transmits knowledge, but relates closely the surest ethical and economic insights to practical problems of co-operation and relief. The university that fails to bring to the problems of the day this sort of helpfulness, misses its function, just as surely as the State that does not learn to depend upon the university for stimulation and for guidance misses the satisfaction of reaping the rewards of its sagacity and its sacrifice in establishing any such social engine. It is only fair to state that the college and the university are developing wonderfully in this respect, and that in just that proportion the State is increasing its generosity towards them.

We have not yet settled either in State or nation that taxation considered as a source of power for the development of education shall be put upon a scientific and equal basis. The whole scheme of taxation is empirical, and the returns from the present methods are not proportionate to the wealth of

the States or communities, and the burdens of it are not borne equally. Here is a great field for economics. There is an amazing under-appreciation of the amount of money necessary for the training of the citizenship of a great State. Virginia now spends,—I talk about Virginia because I know it,—two and three-quarter millions annually, nearly three millions annually, and with this it maintains a six months' public school all over the State for 575,000 children; it maintains one normal school for each race; eight summer normal schools, one university, one technical college for each race, one technical institute, and one college, and is preparing to stimulate secondary education by a bonus of \$50,000 a year. Now Virginia must eventually spend \$6,750,000 in order to get a nine months' public school, three normal schools or more, one hundred high schools, with a great increase in appropriation for higher education. In other words, the American state of 2,000,000 inhabitants that expects to do the right thing by its children must spend nearly \$7,000,000 a year. We might as well know this, for in the end we must reach this sum. Our tax rate is large in proportion to assessed valuation of property, being nearly sixty cents on the hundred dollars, thus comparing favorably with any other American State. We are doing just as well in proportion to our wealth as the States so often held up to us for emulation. Our first problem, therefore, is to increase the wealth to be taxed, rather than the rate of taxation. Our next problem is to decrease the waste and leakage in our present system by unification of educational effort. Our third problem is to democratize and practicalize our education so that it will count more to productivity and increase the values of life. Our fourth problem is to develop every raw resource, every wasted field, to build every factory, to invent every machine, that will increase the assessed value of property taxable for school support.

While I have emphasized the enrichment of the school through the expenditure of money, let no man or woman understand that the main thing is lost sight of, and that main thing is the establishment of moral persistence, of intellectual sturdiness, of unblemished character, of skill in its application to life, of an increasing elevation of the stand-

ards of life, and the steadfast reliance upon the ancient virtues that exalt a nation's character. Neither do I want any one to think that I am trying to strike the heart out of this movement, because I have claimed that we have reached a period of construction instead of emotion and appeal. Heart means love, and love means God, and the power to do things as God would have them done, not counting the costs, but gladly. When that earnest woman, on fire with love, spoke to you last night,—and that no less earnest man, my friend and colleague,—I am sure we all felt as if there were nothing else but love and service in all this wide world. I wish we could put these two “spiritual dynamos,” as the President has called them, upon the same platform and assemble all the doubters and the hard-hearted and recalcitrant and submit them to their influence. The few that would not be converted could be safely left to the grand jury. When Miss Berry pictured for us, as she did with such dramatic power, the face of that young, yet old, toil-worn woman in the Georgia mountains, watching with the infinite patience of love that knows no weariness the man-child that she had brought into the world as he won the prizes of the school, I believe every soul here knew that it was a beautiful face, for the light upon it was God's light shining straight out of His holy face upon her heavy-laden soul, revealing to her a glimpse of the dear heaven of her dreams, and of her hopes. There were tears in my eyes, and there were tears in your eyes, I know. Let us be proud of these tears, for they were tears of gladness and of pride in this dauntless human life of ours that will not stay in the dark; that will struggle upward to the light; that will give service and help to its fellow strugglers, through difficulties, to the stars. No, my friends, I would not strike the heart out of this movement, I would put more heart into it; I would even cry out to the young men and maidens here, “Annex yourselves to such work.” It is your task, it is your chance to do something great in the world. Your grandfathers could fight for theories of human rights, and your fathers for theories of local self-government. It is your privilege to take a hand in this great struggle for the perfection of civilization and the ennobling of democracy.

Fiction and Social Ethics *

BY ERSKINE STEELE

Not the least significant feature of contemporary fiction is its increasingly engrossing preoccupation with the aspects of American social life from the ethical and moral point of view. America is now entering into the main current of modern thought. Morality has breathed into art the breath of a new life. In the drama, Dumas *fil*s pre-empted the prerogative of the preacher; and Ibsen, beginning as romanticist, ended as the supreme polemist of our time. Gerhart Hauptmann and Hermann Sudermann in Germany; Francois de Curel, Eugene Brieux and Paul Hervieu in France; Maxim Gorki in Russia, Hermann Bahr in Austria, José Echegaray in Spain; and Pinero, Shaw, and Jones in England have definitively announced the conjunction of morality and art. In modern fiction, the voice of cosmic consciousness first became powerfully articulate in "Les Misérables;" and after Hugo came Balzac with his grandiose boast that he held the whole of a society within his brain. From a contemplation of the vast frescoes of the "Comédie Humaine," Zola, like James, caught his supreme inspiration; but with Zola, the novelist was swallowed up in the reformer. Then came that exquisite realist Bourget to inaugurate the transition from the romance of observation to the romance of philosophic and social study. George Eliot learned from Comte that the principal function of art is to construct types on the basis furnished by science, and gave to the world social documents of impeccable ethical cogency. The lesson of all great modern art is everywhere to be read: modern life has become informed with purpose. It is the shape of the age.

Two recent novels of American social life betray the grow-

*"The Wheel of Life." By Ellen Glasgow. Doubleday, Page & Co. New York, 1906.

"The House of Mirth." By Edith Wharton. Chas. Scribner's Sons. New York, 1905.

ing sensitiveness of our native artists to the impulse of the age. And yet it is difficult to restrain a feeling of impatience, not to say disappointment, over this new departure in the case of Miss Glasgow, ungrateful though such an attitude may seem. By tradition and social antecedents, Miss Glasgow is closely linked with the life of the *ancien régime* in the South; in spirit and in temperament, she is distinctively modern. While her associations cluster about the aristocratic and spacious social phases of a past era in the South, her intellectual detachment and large sanity peculiarly fit her for writing social documents unwarped by sectional passion or local prejudice. Her first notable book, "The Voice of the People," was a strong and subtle portrayal of the contrasts, distinctions, and incongruities between the old and the new régime in the South. And yet the unconvincing, almost unmotivated ending was doubtless the penalty Miss Glasgow paid to a realism which means life pictured as it is, yet not necessarily consistently motivated or definitely directed toward an end. To say that the book lacked motive is not to say that it lacked a reason. But much of its significance was lost because of its failure to distil the dramatic essence of life, to show the consequences incident upon every human act. The book revealed little more than a strong clash of ideals—the ideals of the old aristocracy and the new democracy. Pride of blood, racial aloofness, and high-bred disdain are put in striking contrast with pride of achievement, unashamed frankness, and avowed democracy. The high-strung, delicately nurtured daughter of the Old South cannot condescend to the coarseness and lowly heritage of the son of the New South, although these qualities in him are redeemed by sincerity, devotion, and steadfast strength. To her who sacrificed her love to racial instinct and aristocratic pride come success, gratification, but all-pervading disillusionment. To him who has offered manliness, power, truth and devotion to the woman of his heart come defeat and death.

In "The Battleground," a story of the Civil War, Miss Glasgow again demonstrated her ability as a candid and unprejudiced historian. Into its fabric she wove not only the

ample facts she had gleaned from a minute study of the literature and documentary records of the period, but also many of the stories, traditions, and legends told her in her childhood of the good old Virginia days. In "The Deliverance" the struggle of "The Voice of the People" is again played out before our eyes, although this, it is true, is not the crucial significance of the book. The rôles are now reversed—the hero is the aristocrat, the heroine the daughter of the overseer of the hero's father. The struggle is not so much the clash of ranks of society, as a more personal conflict—the conflict of a de-classed aristocrat with the ambitious overseer who has most villainously ousted him from his inheritance. The book focuses the interest upon that crucial moment in the life of the individual and of the race when "blood" and "soil" come fiercely to the grapple. In "The Voice of the People," we behold the racial struggle which ensues when the upper and lower strata impinge upon each other, to fall back rudely shaken, broken, shattered. In "The Deliverance" the struggle is an individual, a personal one, yet nerved and enforced by racial animosity and aristocratic disdain. The old aristocratic régime is lowered, the new democratic order is elevated, and the two ultimately meet and unite on the broad and common ground of a great, self-forgetting, human love.

In a review of "The Deliverance," written at the time of its appearance, I expressed the opinion that what makes this book so notable in the literature not only of today, but of the decade, is that it is a marvellous composite of the Southern instinct for feeling and the Northern passion for ethics. It has become almost a banality of criticism to say that the literature of the South reveals remarkable sensitiveness to feeling and sentiment, but not to thought; that it instinctively passes, when dealing with fundamental aspects of life or of nature, out of the realm of thought into that of feeling. In the North, we are only too frequently assured, are to be found the great thinkers, the great moralists, the great ethical teachers, who "see life steadily and see it whole," not through the prismatic and irradiant images of passionate feeling and deep sympathy with nature, but rather with the large,

seeing eye of intellect, moral inspiration, and democratic breadth of thought. Perhaps I may be pardoned for quoting some words of a former article of mine, interpretative of Miss Glasgow's ablest work:

"Here lies the distinctive and supreme importance of Miss Glasgow's *'The Deliverance.'* In this book are blended the characteristics of the writers of both North and South, as these characteristics are labelled by conventional criticism. Here is seen that delicate sympathy with the moods of nature, that sensitiveness of feeling which stoops to deception for the larger sake of sparing human suffering, that expansiveness of poetic and imaginative insight which views man against the background of a primeval and life-infusing nature. It is racy of the soil, with the flavor of virgin earth, the air of wide expanses hanging about its background and its vistas. It conveys an impression of spaciousness; there is always a sense of space and extent, as if the heart of the author had wide horizons of hope and a great reach of passion. These are the Southern hereditaments.

On the other hand, we see the moral problem become the central fire of the story, expand and well nigh envelop the whole picture. The evolution of the young aristocrat through suffering, poverty and degradation, the exfoliation of moral consciousness effected by the vitalizing power of a generous and whole-hearted love, the expansion of moral vision through manly renunciation and truly heroic self-sacrifice—this tells the story in its ethical import and individual significance. These things are largely the qualities of Northern literature—the emphasis upon thought, the primeval, quintessential stress of conscience, the ultimate triumph of right over wrong.

In *'The Deliverance'* these traits of South and North blend in a wonderfully consistent and satisfying picture—a picture instinct with passion, feeling, nature; animate with morality, conscientiousness and ethical finality."

It is not then a matter for surprise that Miss Glasgow, with such diversity of talents, should have abandoned the somewhat circumscribed field of her former novels, and boldly stepped forth into a more cosmopolitan area. And yet in deserting a field in which her pre-eminence was quite generally acknowledged for one alien and untried, she has undertaken a dubious hazard of new fortunes. Massively rounded by its masculinity of touch, focussed again and again to brilliant points, Miss Glasgow's latest book is lacking in one indispensable quality. Lack of intimate familiarity with the life with which it deals may perhaps explain

its failure as a social document of convincing veracity. One may readily accept Miss Glasgow's conclusions; it would be difficult to justify what an impressionist would call the "values" in her picture. Her contrasts lack nothing in sharpness; but her effects of light and shade were secured from the wrong point of view.

And yet, despite this secret sense of disappointment, one finds in this novel much that is sane, mature, and solid. Informed with the modern spirit, it echoes with reverberations of Ibsen, of Maeterlinck, of Shaw. It is, *comme toujours*, an affair of the "eternal triangle"—a pagan devotee of the senses, a worshipper at the shrine of the buried temple of the soul, and a fair idealist ardently cruising, like an Argonaut, in search of the Golden Fleece of life. A dreamer of dreams, seeing life through the "haze of a golden temperament," Laura Wilde is a poetess by default: her poetry is but the translation of her desire for the joy of living. Thrilled through by the magnetic personality of that devotee of dalliance, Arnold Kemper, she flings aside her poetry in exchange for the fulness of life. Like Domini Enfielden in "The Garden of Allah," she wishes to live and to live more abundantly—"to be, to know, to feel, . . . to go through everything, to turn every page, to experience all that can be experienced upon the earth." Prevising neither the illusion of desire nor the disenchantment of passion, she all too readily surrenders to the bold challenge of the male antagonist in the eternal duel of sex. Like Dick Dudgeon in accomplishing the fulfilment of the law of his own nature, Kemper lives upon the surface of life with no more serious passion than "to live in pleasure and to let live in pleasantness." Instead of following Ibsen's injunction to achieve one's destiny in developing one's individuality, Kemper cleaves to the Rabelaisian motto of *l'homme moyen sensuel*: "*Fais ce que tu veux.*" With defiant cynicism, he struggles after the illusion of a happiness which has no part in any possession nor in any object; and self-pityingly fights against the conviction of his own spiritual and moral bankruptcy. The coming of satiety was a rift in his lute, and discounted his pagan view: "Men were not born monogamous"—it was a

favorite jest of his, for he was inclined to throw upon nature the full burden of her responsibility." In striking contrast to Kemper stands Roger Adams, filled with a sense of the secret beauty of the inner life, and secure from the shocks of external fatality in the conviction that all life is forfeiture. With the mystic stoicism of a Maeterlinck, Adams has learned that one must be broken upon the wheel of life and feel the pangs of death before he can attain a philosophic attitude of wise-hearted, broad-visioned tolerance. Only then may one perhaps hope to pluck here and there, in stillness and almost in terror, a few stray flowers of happiness. The radical distinction separating him eternally from Kemper is found in these words: "Too much Nature he (Adams) had learned during those months of mental apathy is in its way quite as destructive as too little—there must be a soul in desire to keep it alive, he understood at last, or the perishing body of it will decay for lack of a vital flame in the very hour of its fulfilment." Only just in time does Laura awake to a consciousness of the satyr in her hero, and bravely take the long straight road of forfeiture and self-denial. And in the end, one surmises, she unites with Roger Adams, in spirit and in the faith that it is not so much what we think, or even what we do, but what we are that eternally matters.

Thus, the book closes, not on an unresolved cadence, but on a positive note, an affirmative chord. Throughout the story, we see the characters sharply silhouetted against the garish background of a fickle, heartless, empty cosmopolitan life of social frivolity. Perry Bridewell, imperfectly monogamous by instinct, was "by nature designed for a lover, and it seemed, broadly viewed, the merest accident of circumstance that he should tend toward variety rather than toward specialization." And there is Gerty, his wife, like Isabel Carnaby, failing to win happiness in the empty life of society, yet pathetically conscious of her inability to be happy without it. True at heart to her fickle, epicurean husband, whom she loves with the ferocity of a wounded animal, she condescends "to lie and cheat and backbite—and strangle her little soul within her"—to please her husband, whose amusement, paradoxically enough, is built on her long bore-

dom. And even at times she has gleams of insight into the life of the soul and vague, unsatisfied longings for an existence she lacks the strength to live. Beyond Kemper, Bridewell, Gerty, Connie Adams, and Brady stretch a vast concourse of feverish pleasure-seekers, starved souls futilely searching for the oasis of happiness upon the arid plains of amusement and frivolity. Seeking happiness above all things, for that very reason they never overtake it. Conversation is surcease from boredom—they talk to fill up the blanks of life. And in this hopeless disillusionment, they are all struggling for forgetfulness—summoning every anodyne—religion, dissipation, morphia—to intoxicate themselves into “forgetting that life is life.”

While the feverish pursuit of pleasure—with its consequent train of disappointments, disillusionments, disenchantments—occupies no small share in imparting tragic significance to Miss Glasgow's uneven book, it is the very *raison d'être* of Mrs. Wharton's “The House of Mirth.” A tragedy of modern life, the latter work takes its apposite title from the Book of Ecclesiastes, vii:4: “The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning; but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth.” As a work of imaginative art, it is destined to take very high rank; it possesses rare distinction in that it inculcates a striking moral lesson and yet never for a moment is marred by the faintest tinge of didacticism. Like Goethe, Mrs. Wharton has demonstrated that no objection can be urged against the artist who keeps a moral in view, provided the subject is given throughout effective and artistic treatment. An incisive and convincing exemplification of George Eliot's dictum that consequences are unpitiful, “The House of Mirth” in purpose and in import must be classed with those works of modern art, from Shakspere's “Hamlet” to Ibsen's “Ghosts,” which are based upon the doctrine that destiny is human character. Lily Bart's feverish life and tragic death find explanation and something of justification in Luther Burbank's theory that heredity is the sum of all past environment. A creature of circumstance, Lily Bart cannot escape from the devitalizing influences at work upon

her from her very birth. Nothing befalls her that is not of the nature of herself; as Goethe has it:

*"So musst du sein, dir kannst du nicht entfliehen
So sagten schon Sybillen und Propheten."*

From her youth, Lily had tacitly been left in ignorance of the value of money, had been taught only to believe that her face was her fortune. She belonged to that class which has the pretensions and prejudices and habits of the rich without its money, and the poverty of the poor without the freedom to avow poverty. Her father became prematurely old and finally died in the effort to keep his family in luxury, or as they snobbishly expressed it, from "living like pigs." The life of the Barts, struggling desperately to maintain a necessarily precarious foothold in the "idle rich class," is based upon soul-destroying pretense. "To this pretense," to quote certain apposite words of Bernard Shaw, "involving a prodigious and continual lying as to incomes and the social standing of relatives, are sacrificed citizenship, self-respect, freedom of thought, sincerity of character and all the realities of life, its votaries gaining in return the hostile estrangement of the great mass of their fellow creatures, and in their own class the supercilious snubs of those who have outdone them in pretension and the jealous envy of those whom they have outdone." Left a derelict upon this sea of social folly, Lily stifles the promptings of her heart in favor of vain aspirations after wealth and splendor. In her eyes, to "marry well" meant not so much to secure happiness, as to capture wealth and social position. After they had lost all their money, her mother used to say to her with a kind of fierce vindictiveness: "But you'll get it all back—you'll get it all back, with your face." Lily turns a glacial surface to life, stifling within her the generous passions even at their very birth. Lacking courage for sacrifice and self-surrender, she turns a deaf ear alike to the promptings of conscience and the mute protestations of her heart. Luxury she wishes above all things; not Brand himself was more resolute in willing his own destruction through insistence upon the fateful All or Nothing. But from the very first,

the spirit of compromise begins to dog Lily's footsteps; she is pursued by the ghost of chance. Had the furies left her even for an instant, her life might have been a sacrament instead of an atonement. A glance, a touch of the hand, the merest turn of the screw would have sufficed. She is exposed to contamination at every turn, compromise upon compromise is forced upon her, stage by stage is she lowered in self-respect. And yet, throughout all her manifold temptations she manages in some mysterious way to preserve the core of integrity at the heart of her nature. Our emotions are purged, in Aristotelian phrase, through terror and pity by the spectacle of her instinctive, almost unconscious struggle to retain her inner essential purity. We stand transfixed with the most poignant compassion at the deep damnation of her taking off. In a recent letter, Mrs. Wharton said to me that the thesis of "The House of Mirth," if it must be sought anywhere, is to be found in these words (pp. 515-6):

"It was no longer, however, from the vision of material poverty that she (Lily) turned with the greatest shrinking. She had a sense of deeper impoverishment—of an inner destitution compared to which outward conditions dwindled into insignificance. It was indeed miserable to be poor—to look forward to a shabby, anxious, middle-age, leading by dreary degrees of economy and self-denial to gradual absorption in the dingy communal existence of the boarding house. But there was something more miserable still—it was the clutch of solitude at her heart, the sense of being swept like a stray uprooted growth down the current of the years. That was the feeling which possessed her now—the feeling of being something rootless and ephemeral, mere spin-drift of the whirling surface of existence, without anything to which the poor little tentacles of self could cling before the awful flood submerged them. And as she looked back she saw that there had never been a time when she had had any real relation to life. Her parents, too, had been rootless, blown hither and thither on every wind of fashion, without any personal existence to shelter them from its shifting gusts. She herself had grown up without any one spot of earth being dearer to her than another: there was no centre of early pieties, of grave enduring traditions, to which her heart could revert and from which it could draw strength for itself and tenderness for others. In whatever form a slowly-accumulated past lives in the blood—whether in the concrete image of the old house stored with visual memories, or in the conception of the house not built with hands, but made up of inherited passions and loyalties—it has the same power of broadening and deepening the individual existence, of attaching it by mysterious links of kinship to all the mighty sum of human striving."

In "The House of Mirth," Mrs. Wharton has achieved the astounding *tour de force* of writing a novel as realistic as anything of Bourget, which is, at the same time as absorbingly interesting as a romance of Weyman. The fidelity to fact of her human documents, the verisimilarity to nature of her characters, the veracity of her portraiture of a certain phase of contemporary society cannot with justice be called into question. The whole texture of the story is exquisite in the delicacy and the artistic deftness displayed in its construction, its workmanship. The fable is narrated in a tone of high seriousness and in a spirit of profound compassion. The style in which the tale is told has all the perfection of the style of Henry James with none of its obscurity. Indeed the style is so perfect that it almost awakes one's regret over its perfection; the characters are so accurately observed, so damningly portrayed that we shudder over the irony of the phrases, "the upper classes," and the "best society." "The House of Mirth" is a signal specimen of that reflective fiction which Stendahl has described as *un miroir promenant sur la grande route*. It is a "criticism of life, which is also a judgment."

Public Open Spaces in American Towns and Cities*

BY **FREDERICK LAW OLNSTED, JR.,** AND **JOHN NOLEN**

At the present time public spirited people in this country appreciate the value of open spaces in towns and cities. They realize that such areas are not only desirable, but increasingly necessary in order that opportunity for exercise and for the enjoyment of outdoor beauty may be more generally provided. In a vague way they approve of a large increase in the number of playgrounds and parks. But few even in the more enlightened communities seem yet to understand that these open spaces are of great variety, that they are or should be selected and designed to serve radically different purposes, and that the failure to understand this principle and to keep it constantly in mind leads to gross waste and inefficiency in our public grounds. In few other phases of private or public life is there so generally a lack of clear thinking. This is an important matter for American municipalities to consider, for failure to select sites discriminately, to design them for specific purposes and to confine their use to those purposes is to lose to a considerable degree the benefits that might otherwise accrue to the people and to waste the public funds.

It is, of course, true in this case as in most other matters that there is some overlapping. The purposes are not absolutely distinct and most public grounds are serviceable in a number of different ways. But it is equally true that the greatest efficiency here as elsewhere depends upon clear and intelligent differentiation, upon a recognition that the ends to be served are different and that therefore different means must usually be employed to meet them.

This article aims only to outline in a general way the more

*The authors have prepared this paper for simultaneous publication in the *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY* and in *Charities*. Mr. Olmsted is Professor of Landscape Architecture in Harvard University and Mr. Nolen is a landscape architect of Cambridge, Mass. The latter is now engaged in park construction in Charlotte, N. C., and other Southern cities.

important types of public grounds. For the sake of convenience and clearness they will be considered under six heads: (1) Streets, Boulevards and Parkways; (2) City Squares, Commons and Public Gardens; (3) Playgrounds (a) For little children, (b) For children of the school age, (c) For older boys and men and for girls and women; (4) Small or Neighborhood Parks; (5) Large Parks; (6) Great Outlying Reservations. These six divisions may be said to represent the normal requirements of large cities. For somewhat smaller places the Outlying Reservations and in some cases even the Large Parks might not be necessary. In such matters there can be no absolute rule. No system of public grounds could possibly be devised that would fit any and every community, for no two communities are alike. They represent infinite variations arising from differing physical, historical and social conditions. Success in any particular case will depend, therefore, not only upon a recognition of the different types of public grounds, but also upon an accurate and sympathetic estimate of the peculiar local conditions and local needs.

I. STREETS, BOULEVARDS AND PARKWAYS.

All communities, no matter what their size may be, need to regard the character and appearance of their streets. To do this intelligently, they must consider the primary purpose that streets in various parts of the town or city are to serve. For example, streets in the business sections would not normally be the same in width or treatment as in residential sections. Again, thoroughfares making through connections from one part of the city to another or even to outlying towns, would be different in many essential ways from streets that are intended for merely local use. This division of the subject, therefore, is fundamental and of practically universal concern. And a proper consideration of it should affect definitely the city plan.

Boulevards and Parkways are agreeable promenades in themselves and serve usually as pleasant means of access to parks from other parts of the city or from one park to another. Boulevards are usually arranged formally with rows

of shade trees and parallel ways for those on foot and on wheels. The simplest type has a broad drive in the centre with a walk on either side, separated from the drive by a belt of turf and always shaded by trees. Frequently two drive-ways are provided with a broad space between containing trees and turf and sometimes foot paths, bicycle paths, bridle paths or other conveniences; and often shrubs, flowers, statues and other decorations. In recent years some boulevards have been made to provide for electric car tracks upon a special turfed reservation with rows of trees, where the cars can attain high speed with little danger of collision with other vehicles. Such reservations are generally between two roadways, but in some suburban districts a double track is placed on either side of a single roadway between the curb and sidewalk.

A Parkway so far as it can be discriminated from a Boulevard, includes more breadth of turf or planted ground and also usually narrow passages of natural scenery of varying widths, giving it a somewhat parklike character and inducing a less formal treatment of the roads, paths and accessory features. Parkways are frequently laid out along streams so as to include the natural beauty of brook or river scenery and to preserve the main surface water channels in public control, thus providing for the adequate, economical and agreeable regulation of storm drainage and floods.

II. CITY SQUARES, COMMONS AND PUBLIC GARDENS.

These are a most usual type of public recreation grounds and often the most open to the charge of ill-considered selection and design. An opinion prevails very generally that a city cannot have too many "Squares" or "breathing places," and if they are not built upon and are green with grass and trees that they justify themselves. In a measure this is true and yet by taking thought these same areas may be made many times more serviceable. They are usually of small size and are found in the business as well as the residential sections of a city. Their principal functions are to furnish agreeable views for those passing by them or through them in the course of their daily business and to provide a pleasant

resting place or promenade for the much smaller number who take the time to use them in this manner. On account of the almost constant passing through such squares the best arrangement is to provide for reasonably direct and convenient paths along the lines most used. Where this is not done many of those who use the square are likely to be so irritated by the indirectness as to miss much of the pleasure they might otherwise receive. A formal plan of walks, either on straight lines or curved, is generally adopted for such squares and is well suited to the conditions and to the decorative treatment of the area, providing much more effectively than irregular plans for the numerous statues, fountains, and gay flower beds which have their most appropriate location in such places. Shade trees, either as a complete grove or in rows along the paths or grouped in some more complex plan, are almost essential features of such squares. A modification of this type of square is sometimes met with where the space, instead of being used for a short cut and for enjoyment from within, is designed primarily to present an agreeable picture to those passing it upon the adjacent streets. When the area is very small and the passing is almost wholly along one side, this treatment is most effective, because, where the only aim is a beautiful pictorial effect from a limited point of view, better results can be obtained than when appearances must be reconciled with other uses of the land. Nevertheless, there are few cases in which a small square will not have a greater recreative value to the public if its pictorial aspect is somewhat sacrificed to such uses as resting and promenading.

III. PLAYGROUNDS.

To no other form of public recreation grounds is so much attention now being directed as to playgrounds. An illustration of this fact is to be noted in the recent organization in Washington of the Playground Association of America. It has now come to be recognized that convenient provision for exercise in the open air is indispensable if we are to preserve health of body and mind. Indeed it is a matter of vital importance, calling more and more loudly for systematic municipal action as cities increase in size and density of popula-

tion, as more and more people come to be engaged in confining occupations and as quick and cheap transportation constantly reduces the amount of exercise which people take as an incident to their daily work. In a general way the imperative need for playgrounds is coming to be recognized, especially as regards children whose development into healthy and useful members of the community depends quite as much upon physical as upon mental exercise.

These playgrounds are of three classes. The first to be considered is for the smallest children. Whether in connection with school grounds or elsewhere, there should be in each neighborhood, a space not open to the hurly burly of the larger children, where mothers may take little tots, mostly under the school age, to get quiet, out-of-door pleasure and exercise. A plain lawn, if well cared for, will stand their usage and is of the greatest value for them to play about upon. But for these youngsters even more than the older children, it is needful to offer something to play *with* and nothing is more useful than a pile of clean sea sand. Its value is increased if water is near at hand to wade and dabble in. A small, shallow basin in which they can play and paddle gives to hundreds of city children an amount of healthful pleasure that is cheaply bought at the price of setting apart such limited areas for their exclusive use.

But perhaps the most important playgrounds are for the children of the school age and these can best be arranged and used in connection with the schools. Of course many schools have playgrounds, but these are seldom large enough, for as school buildings have grown in size to meet the increasing demand, playgrounds have generally been encroached upon instead of being correspondingly enlarged. If it is agreed that it is almost as important for the city to provide adequate playground accommodations as it is to provide school rooms, there is need of very greatly increasing the present playground areas. A few large playgrounds in remote places where land is cheap will not answer the purpose, which is to give opportunity for exercise and active play near the children's homes, and preferably next to the school, so that it can be used during the recesses as well as after hours. Bare earth or some

kind of pavement is the only surface that will stand the concentrated and constant use to which such a playground should be put, but that is no reason for making it an absolute Sahara of desolation. Trees will grow in such an area if adequate pains are taken to supply them with a quantity of good soil under the hard surface and to give their roots artificially the water which that surface cuts off. Vines on the buildings and a hedge or narrow border of attractive flowering shrubs, reducing the playing area by a very small percentage, would often make the place more attractive to the children and give them some of the recreative value of beauty which is cheaply purchased even at the cost of a few square feet of additional land. Moreover it can often be secured by the ingenious use of corners and strips that would be otherwise wasted. In this way the playground may be made an attractive and serviceable place to others besides the children and might be used by the elders in certain hours when not needed by the children. The devotion of much detailed ingenuity to getting the best possible use out of the city's investment in playground land is a corollary to the importance of providing adequate playgrounds.

The third class of playgrounds is for the older boys and young men, and for girls and women. As the city grows there is a constantly decreasing inducement or even opportunity for taking in the form of play the exercise which many of them fail to get in their daily work. For them are needed out door gymnasia and places for athletic sports. Unfortunately many of these sports require considerable area in proportion to the numbers engaged in them and for these the grounds must generally be at a greater distance from the people's homes than is reasonable for the other playgrounds. Moreover, some of these needs are cared for by private enterprises through clubs and associations and so far as this can be done, it becomes unnecessary for the city to burden itself with the duty; but there are and always will be many who have not the means nor the organizing power to secure such grounds for themselves, and the city can better afford to act as their agent and supply them with attractive grounds than to have them use their surplus energy in ways less

useful to themselves and to the community. Grounds of this class should include ball fields, running tracks, places for jumping, vaulting, throwing the hammer and quoits, bowling and the like. The grounds should be ample, accessible, thoroughly complete in their arrangement and well maintained.

Here, then, we have three kinds of exercise so distinct as to call for three several kinds of grounds differing radically in size, distribution and arrangement although the apparently specific name of "playground" might be properly applied to each.

IV. SMALL OR NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS.

Under this heading may be included pleasure grounds of from 10 to 100 or even 200 acres in area. Except in extent such parks are not essentially different in the purpose they serve and the character of their design from City Squares and Gardens. But this difference in extent affords an opportunity for a degree of breadth and freedom that is unobtainable in the smaller grounds. On the other hand the seclusion from the city and the broad and beautiful natural scenery that characterize the larger "rural" parks, cannot here be had. Yet small passages of interesting and agreeable scenery are often possible. This scenery can seldom be natural in appearance, but it can often be quite beautiful, a certain elaboration, elegance and even magnificence taking the place of the more quiet and restful simplicity of the large park in a way that appeals very obviously to many people. And there is, therefore, more or less tendency to develop large parks in the same direction. It is unfortunate that it should be so, for these ends can be attained almost as well upon small parks as upon large, and therefore it is clearly a mistake to treat a large park in this style. It is because more cities have small parks of this elaborate and what might be called gardenesque character than have large and simple rural parks that many people have a perverted conception of what constitutes a park. These small parks are frequently used for the display of interesting and showy flowering shrubs and trees and make a feature of fountains, statues and other sculpture. In moderation such objects, together with terraces and other architectural work, are entirely appropriate and desirable in

parks of this class and add much to the effect of elegance and richness, for the enjoyment is closely related to that offered by architecture and decorative design and other pleasures forming a party of daily city life.

V. LARGE PARKS.

The large Park, or the Rural or Country Park as it is now generally designated, comprises in most cases from two hundred to a thousand acres and is the chief feature of a city park system. It is seldom undertaken except by large cities or cities so rapidly growing that the need of such provision can be clearly foreseen. Its main object is to provide conveniently in some degree for that sort of recreation which is to be obtained by strolling or driving in a pleasant country district. There is no doubt that the enjoyment of beautiful natural scenery is to the majority of city dwellers one of the most refreshing antidotes for the wearing influences of city life. Where cities are of moderate size and are surrounded by a beautiful country district this enjoyment is readily accessible to the mass of the population and it has fortunately become more so in proportion to the size of cities within the last twenty-five years through the development of electric car lines and the use of the bicycle and automobile; but this increased accessibility of the country has been in part offset by the growth of the cities during the same period and by the serious impairment of rural quiet in the suburban regions through the same cause, i. e., improved cheap transportation. It is necessary, therefore, if the people of large cities are to have easy access to refreshing rural scenery that the municipality should withdraw from its taxable areas a tract sufficiently large to provide some such scenery within its own limits. The cost, both directly in money and indirectly through interference with the street system and with the normal commercial development of the land, is necessarily very great and only the purpose of providing beautiful scenery, thoroughly contrasting with city life and measurably sequestered from all its sights and sounds can justify this heavy cost; because almost all the other purposes served in public recreation grounds can be met more economically and far more conven-

iently in smaller areas distributed throughout the city. Therefore, the essential characteristic of a well designed and well managed park of this class is that all of the other numerous objects which it may serve are subordinated absolutely to the provision of scenery of a natural, quieting and beautiful character.

But of course it is not enough merely to possess large areas of rural scenery, however perfect; they must be made available to large numbers of people and it is the problem of making them available without destroying their most valuable quality that presents the greatest practical difficulty to the landscape architect. To turn the public loose upon them without restrictions and without the artificial appearance given by broad paths and roads, might be at the beginning delightful; but the marks of man's interference would soon be set upon the landscape far more universally and conspicuously by wear and tear than even by a number of constructed roads, and at the same time the inconvenience in getting about would interfere with the comfort of the visitor and enjoyment of much of the landscape. Therefore, roads, paths, steps, bridges, seats, shelters, buildings and other constructions must nearly always be introduced. These can seldom be made to look like anything except the works of man and the disingenuous attempts occasionally made to palm some of them off as freaks of "Nature," in the way of curiously arranged ledges, grottoes, and what not, almost invariably seem so childish and affected as to be more obtrusive than a frank recognition of their man-made character. But on the other hand these things while treated frankly and simply as human constructions, may be made either relatively inconspicuous and subordinate elements of the landscape or may be elaborated into strikingly conspicuous features. In rural parks such conspicuousness is too heavy a price to pay even for great individual beauty in the features to which it may call attention, because it is so essentially contradictory to the purpose of the parks. Of course beauty should be sought for in every element and detail of park construction, but in the rural park it should be of the shy and modest sort which appears to be done not for its own sake, but solely for its contribution to

the general effect. It should in no way invite public attention and admiration to itself.

Prospect Park, Brooklyn, containing five hundred and twenty-six acres, and Franklin Park, Boston, with about the same area, are useful illustrations of what large city parks may be. In neither, it is true, have the intentions of the designer been fully realized and yet the main idea,—the provision of beautiful scenery of the type that is called natural—has not been departed from.

VI. GREAT OUTLYING RESERVATIONS.

As yet this class of reservations has not come at all generally into the possession of American municipalities. It consists of forests, beaches, meadows, mountains, lakes and rivers,—those natural features of universal interest and beauty that in one form or another surround so many of our cities. Such features are of necessity great in extent, but as they are almost always located at a considerable distance from the centres of population and are often ill-adapted to the requirements of trade and house building, they are not excessively costly. These reservations differ from "Rural Parks" in three particulars. They are usually located at a much greater distance from the centres of population, they are of larger area, and as they are less used they require less in the way of artificial constructions. Their chief value is in the protection they offer for future generations; therefore their preservation and possession by the public is of immense importance.

The most notable of such reservations in the United States are those in the possession of the Boston Metropolitan District, including four forest reservations with a total area of over ten thousand acres, also twenty-three miles of connecting parkway, seven or eight miles of seashore and thirty miles of river bank. But little more than a decade ago this system was non-existent and the invaluable reservations that comprise it today were the possession of private individuals, to do with as they would. The success of this system is an instructive and inspiring example of what can be achieved by enlightened, persistent and well-directed effort.

The conclusion that this paper aims to reach is that large towns and cities need not only to increase the number of their public grounds, but more especially to increase their variety. A complex system is called for. More than an increase in expenditure, there must be a widening of aims, a finer discrimination, an expansion of the ideas of service, and a more accurate estimate of local conditions and local needs. The size, character and location of sites for each particular purpose must be more carefully considered, as well as the nature of the design and its faithful maintenance. Now is the time to turn active attention to these matters, for it is now that so many communities, especially in the South, are moving to increase the number of their exercise and pleasure grounds. Energetic doing should be guided by clearer thinking.

The Value of a State Library Commission

BY JOHN P. KENNEDY, JR.,

State Librarian of Virginia

For a century prior to the war between the states, the questions of government were largely constitutional: since that time they have become mainly administrative. The questions of independence, inter-relationship of governmental departments, of states' rights, and suffrage, that occupied so much attention during our early life as a nation, are now succeeded by the relation of the state to the great corporations, by the industrial struggles of capital and labor, by state aid in the development of our country's resources, and by many other educational, industrial and philanthropic enterprises. The problems of the nation, therefore, have passed from one arena into another, where civic development dominates interest, and progress is demanded.

In this great work all classes of society and government are participants, which has resulted in increased administrative activity and supervision. Many laws have been placed upon our statute books, which require no special machinery for their execution; but more frequently a special need—industrial, educational, philanthropic—has called into existence a special organ of government to supervise, aid, or manage the affair. This is the source of those boards and commissions which have in late years become prominent in all the states, but more particularly in those having the most complex and highly developed industrial organization. These bodies are the latest product of governmental evolution. They have developed since the war between the states, many of them during the last two decades; and a study of their form and action will reveal the tendencies of governmental progress, and the advance already made in certain directions toward paternalism and state socialism.

My purpose is not to discuss generally the many forms of state aid and supervision, but to dwell wholly upon the live question of state library commissions or boards.

It is a source of vital interest to us of Southern birth, that in moulding our progress, we should follow closely such lines of development as will tend to promote the interests of our people. In doing this it is well to bear in mind that libraries broaden the minds of men more rapidly than many other educational institutions. It is, therefore, imperative that they should be governed after the most approved ideas, and by such people as have vested in them the power of capable administration.

To accomplish this end it is necessary: First, that politics and libraries separate; second, that non-partisan library boards or state commissions be created; and lastly, that the birth of a library of the people, instituted in their behalf, and operating solely for them, be announced. Until this is done civic encouragement cannot be expected nor healthy progress maintained.

With the advent of the library commission, wherever created, are recorded its duties in unmistakable form:

1. The establishment of permanent local libraries.
2. The organization and improvement of existing libraries, including the training of librarians in necessary technical knowledge.
3. The circulation of free reading matter in places which have no libraries, commonly in the shape of traveling libraries. These three divisions will cover almost, if not all, the work which a commission can do, especially in the South, where the field is large and opportunities greater than elsewhere.

Judging the library situation from the common point of view it is well to bear in mind that the experience of others, even in adjacent states, cannot be accepted as a guarantee of the ultimate outcome of the undertaking in North Carolina. Experience teaches the trained librarian that the same principles applied in different localities rapidly conform with conditions characteristic of surroundings and seldom, if ever, evolve similar results. This is due in every instance to exigencies peculiar to location, and is largely affected by climate, class and clientele. It is, therefore, unwise to accept the results of any commission outside of your state as indicative in any particular of the success or failure of your project.

Dismissing all comparisons as inapplicable to this library question, the first duty of a North Carolina commission would be to frame such laws as home conditions warrant. In proceeding along this line the first thought would be the establishment of permanent local libraries, governed as is determined best and in accordance with the needs of your people. This question would undoubtedly assume paramount proportions in the minds of any commission, since its greatest achievements depend upon its solution.

The establishment of free public libraries, which are used everywhere in connection with the public school systems, is an important field of labor in the South. In nearly every state in the union laws encouraging libraries of this kind are in operation, but I do not know of a single law in any Southern state that cannot be materially improved upon. This condition naturally appeals to students of the library movement, and would at once become the subject of earnest discussion by any well-balanced library commission.

The various plans of administration for public libraries that have been discussed from time to time, have resulted in three distinct systems: First, in the formation of libraries under the direction of a non-partisan board of library commissioners, who serve without salary, but who may expend five hundred dollars annually for clerk hire, traveling and incidental expenses; second, each civic division of the state, as a school district, town or county is given power to levy taxes by a vote of its citizens for the establishment and support of public libraries, either in connection with its public schools or separate from them; and third, a system of subsidies from the state to public libraries, no library to receive over three hundred dollars per year, and all grants to be made in books to the library.

In one state or another all these systems are operated by library commissions, and each has given satisfactory results. It is, therefore, of great moment to North Carolina that library legislation be enacted. A proper amount of encouragement furnished by the state as evidence of the appreciation of interest displayed in libraries by any given locality, would be heralded as a distinct advance worthy of special aid

and interest. Where a town or community is willing to assess itself for any sum of money ranging from fifty dollars to three hundred dollars, an equivalent sum set aside for investment of this kind by the state should be turned over to the commission having the project in hand. A law of this kind would unquestionably result in the establishment of libraries within the bounds of its jurisdiction, and the appropriation necessary to promote such interest in education need not exceed two thousand dollars annually for at least five years. A board of trustees of a single town or locality reporting annually to the state library commission, would reveal, in a short time, the wisdom of such a law, and until an interest of this kind is taken in the individual demands made upon the state by educational centres, for aid in support of local interests, little advance in public libraries will characterize the general library movement in the South. As evidence of the interest shown in other states, I deem it wise to call attention to certain laws in effect that promote the growth of libraries. In Wisconsin a county library board consisting of five members is established, and the county may levy a tax of five hundred dollars a year, and two hundred dollars thereafter, and gifts may be accepted for such libraries and a tax for maintenance levied up to fifteen per cent of the gift.

Wyoming authorizes county library trustees to pay expenses for repairing buildings furnished rent free for libraries. The county clerk in Oregon may levy a property tax for each child of four to twenty, to be used for library development, while South Dakota appropriates ten cents per capita of school population from the school funds for libraries. In New Hampshire, the establishment of public libraries in every town is mandatory. California has a similar law which makes it imperative for the town officials to establish a library when one-fourth of the voters approve it. New Jersey, Idaho and New York go so far as to allow taxation for libraries to extend beyond the limit fixed for their use. Maine recognizes a free library maintained by an association as a public library, though such a library may not be controlled by the public. In Minnesota cities and villages of less than fifty thousand population are allowed to receive

gifts of library buildings, to secure sites, and pledge a tax of one to one and a half mills, if necessary, to carry the project into effect.

From this will be seen the general scope of interest in libraries and library advance exhibited outside of your borders. The demand throughout the North, East, Middle West, Northwest and Western states for progress of this kind has never met any serious opposition, and where a law based upon good principle and example was needed, it has seldom failed to be entered upon the statute books.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted in behalf of our Southern educational interests that library laws embodying the successful and dominant principles of similar laws of other states be enacted, thus insuring equal opportunity for reading to a free and equal people. Once passed, such laws become effective only when applied by promoters of library interests, and at this point the true value of a commission is discerned. Assuming, for the sake of illustration, that any county or city within your borders could levy a tax of one mill to sustain a library, would the power of that law alone accomplish the purpose for which it was enacted? Many towns would never hear of its existence, and a still greater number would be uninterested. The duty of a commission would be to publish and scatter it broadcast over the state, and follow this action by personal visitation and appeal. In many towns, public spirited persons need only to have the path defined, but in others labor is required and expected. Such a law should also empower a commission to offer a small sum of money to any town that wished to establish a local library, with the understanding that an annual town appropriation for its support would follow, and that state supervision should exist. This would preclude any possibility of failure and result in strong and serviceable institutions. Secondly, and of little less importance is the commission's duty of reorganization and improvement of existing libraries, including the training of librarians in necessary technical knowledge.

When a library commission comes into existence, the various libraries in which it is interested at once become

centres of state attention. Debts or heavy burdens of one kind or another, are found to exist frequently, and where this is not the case, poor system and bad management are frequently encountered. Again, many libraries will be found that have had bare existence for years and many subscription libraries may actually be facing starvation. In either case the duty of the commission is most apparent, and in almost every instance new impetus results. The course usually followed in cases of this character, is to urge the necessity of a free library, upon a self-supporting basis, or where taxation for library purposes is permitted by statute, to follow this plan. Other common difficulties encountered are lack of interest; indiscriminate purchase of books; insufficient funds; and untrained librarians,—the latter being the most dangerous of all library diseases. With a commission and state library association, however, as constant sources of encouragement, there is no occasion for poor librarians, and with their exit disappear many of the ailments which usually retard library progress.

Another difficulty promising to confront all Southern library commissions is the securing of facts concerning libraries and the annual records of their doings. To the student of library statistics the South has ever been an enigma. The returns from any single Southern state have never been known to be complete, and as a result our libraries receive the poorest rating possible to be accorded them.

To illustrate the utter lack of interest displayed by Southern librarians in this important work, I present the figures representing North Carolina, as they appear in the report of the United States Department of Education for 1904: In 1903, eighty-four North Carolina libraries reported 374,778 books and so far as the world knows this figure represents the grand total for the State. No student, however, believes that this is the total number of volumes in the libraries in North Carolina. The only comfort in this statement lies in the fact that it represents an increase of twenty-seven libraries over 1900, and 89,527 books. Using the above figures as a basis of calculation, it is ascertained that the percentage of growth during that three year period is registered at 31.39.

This record is only excelled in the South Atlantic division by the states of West Virginia and South Carolina, and is indicative of a great future provided your library affairs are properly and judiciously administered.

Reading a little further in the same report unhealthy conditions are everywhere indicated. For example, only 29 libraries are supposed to receive magazines and so far as the world knows only 1201 subscriptions for this class of literature were awarded by your combined libraries in 1903. The library world is also apprised of but 121,608 volumes being circulated by the free libraries in your State during 1903, while but 3,700 books were recorded as used in the library buildings proper. This is supposed to include all reference books in service as well as other classes of literature. What better illustration do we want of the need of a library commission, pride in library records, and interest in library work than these statements, which have emanated from your own institutions?

One thing that is very clear from reports made to the United States government by North Carolina libraries, is that much greater interest in libraries exists among the people than among the librarians. I cite in corroboration of this statement the fact that but two libraries in your State are compelled to pay rent for the buildings they occupy. Nineteen buildings are owned outright by the library authorities and sixty-three are furnished without cost. No more healthful a prospect could possibly exist in any state than is here represented. As an illustration that it is possible to support your libraries by taxation, I have but to recall to your minds that at least twenty libraries are already so supported; also that sixty-two are recorded as supported by corporations; and two by donations; this, I am satisfied, is not the showing that actual facts will make.

A reference to the general classification of the various libraries throughout North Carolina reveals the fact that you have but eight libraries of general character; thirty-eight school; twenty-six college; one college society; three law; one theological; one state; two asylum; three Y. M. C. A. and one Odd Fellow. From my knowledge of your libraries, I

am satisfied that you have at least twelve of general character; two scientific and two historical, which at once gives the State a higher rating than above recorded, to say nothing of the numerous libraries of which no mention is made whatever. This classification, therefore, is in direct contradiction to the actual condition of affairs existing in North Carolina and it is an injustice to the State at large that such a report should be permitted to be in print.

Referring to the incomes of your libraries from various sources, the United States Bureau of Education reports that not a single one is supported by direct taxation. To this, no exception is taken, but with the advent of library legislation your experience will be entirely different. Two libraries report that they received \$3,000 from either the city, county or State, while but one reports an endowment and that of \$300.00 only. Again, as an evidence of the great interest displayed by your people in libraries, it is gratifying to note that 25,938 volumes were donated during 1903. This indicates hearty co-operation in event of the formation of a library commission as is contemplated.

Lastly, another statement which is not readily understood, is to the effect that only twenty-four libraries received money during 1903, and that the total amount was \$38,051.00; but where expenditures are reported, twenty-five libraries are said to have used this money, and the total expenditures aggregated but \$22,397.00. Accepting this to be true, these libraries had more money than they had need for, which is certainly a condition unknown to exist in any other state in this union.

Reflecting upon this report as made by the United States government, it is most apparent that a gross injustice has been done North Carolina. On the other hand, the report is based upon statements made by your librarians, though this does not excuse the editor of the work in the least. It would have been better to publish the individual reports as they were received from the various libraries; but a composite report based upon such statements is, I respectfully submit, most misleading.

No state in the South has a better right to be correctly rep-

resented in the annals of civic advance than has North Carolina, and no state is more zealous of representations made of its possessions. It is, therefore, imperative that something be done to awaken interest in your libraries that will insure not only a healthful growth, but at the same time see that such representations as are made are complete in every respect.

The experience of Virginia is not unlike that of North Carolina, but with our library board in operation and its influences felt, nothing of this kind will again occur. It devolves upon the Southern states as a whole to see that our library conditions and reports are better than ever before, and that each institution be given a healthful administration, especially those that have lain dormant since their birth.

We in Virginia are ready to assume our share of this responsibility and nothing would be more joyful to our people than to know that the yoke has been cast from our Southern libraries, and that freedom of thought and administration has been accorded each institution. Such a condition existing, the training of librarians would be everywhere undertaken. Library science is a study, and one that is most difficult to master. The duties of a librarian are varied and many, and no one can possibly follow the profession unless trained for the purpose. New ideas arise every day for consideration, and the librarian who is not alive to the progress being made in the library world soon becomes a fossil. This likewise is the duty of library commissions, hence the necessity for a law in North Carolina, as well as in other Southern states, creating such bodies.

Lastly I wish to take up the third duty of a library commission which involves many arduous and difficult tasks, viz.: the circulation of reading matter in places which have no libraries, commonly in the shape of traveling libraries.

An extension of our educational system to include libraries for farmers as free as those for town people, is demanded by every consideration of sound public policy. National preservation and patriotism demand for the masses a thorough education in order that they may meet political, social and industrial conditions, that are from time to time becoming

more complex. To the farmer the movements of the world come by reading, and unhampered by social distraction, what he reads becomes generally family discussion; so for this reason, if no other, it is imperative that so great an opportunity to instruct mankind be exercised, and the education of the individual, whether thorough and expensive, or largely received in early life, should include every advantage possible in order to make it a life-long education. Such is the conclusion of every well-balanced library commission, and the remedy largely lies in the traveling library. Wielding the vast power which traveling libraries create, the state is ever ready to tender aid to any section at any time, and when laws permit of such supervision of school libraries as well, the problem of successful administration of the state's library interests is fathomed. The great mistake which some states have made regarding their school libraries, is in placing too much dependence in school trustees. These officers have a multitude of duties to perform, and it is illogical to suppose that they can be increased without decreasing the efficiency of service along the whole school front. "Experience has taught more than one state that wherever the school authorities have charge of libraries, with the exceptions only frequent enough to prove the rule, the library is crowded into a subordinate position. Study and observation confirms what may be expected, that the best results in school libraries can be obtained only when such libraries are in charge of state trustees, whose supreme interest is therein centered. School trustees properly look upon the school as the all important thing, and the library as a more or less valuable adjunct, and as the result it is kept in a subordinate position which stifles its proper development." This has been the deduction of library students for years, and it cannot be reasonable to expect that conditions will so materially change, that after a reasonable period it will be found that we have accomplished that which other states have considered, tried and in no uncertain degree condemned.

The traveling library, therefore, for the rural districts and small towns, and state supervision of all school libraries is sound public policy. This labor in itself is worthy of the

best efforts of a library commission, and until we recognize one supreme head in library matters, in each state—one source of ready aid fostered by the state,—it is needless to suppose that other than unsatisfactory results can follow.

A study of the question of school libraries is most interesting. It is everywhere demanded that every high school should have a permanent reference library made up of books essential to the progress of the students attending such school to be used as works of reference and courts of final resort. These collections should contain dictionaries, encyclopedias, both historical and biographical, compendiums of statistics, briefs for debate, complete files of book catalogues and cross reference aids, such as finding lists to periodicals, etc.; standard authorities on the dominant questions of history, both developed and in the process of making, and such other authorities upon rhetoric, mathematics, belles lettres, the sciences and arts, as are considered requisite, attending a high school education. These collections should be purchased outright by the state and considered as assets of its educational system. As such they should be under the direct supervision and control of a state library commission, whose duty it would be to require principals of said high schools to report annually thereupon, making such recommendation for purchase as they deem essential to the progress of the student. With this class of excellent libraries scattered among the high schools, should be associated traveling libraries for children.

The time has arrived when no cautious librarian considers for a moment the idea that there should be a library in every school house. It is believed, however, that in such communities as would properly care for libraries belonging to their public schools their wishes should be considered; but the placing of a permanent library in some far distant country school which is open on an average of but seven months a year, is in my judgment most unwise. Traveling libraries for children should be sent to these schools where they could be cared for during the term and returned to the custody of the state during the summer months. These collections consisting of history, fiction, biography, sciences, poetry, belles

lettres, social arts and domestic sciences, should go to such schools as are designated by the library commission at the beginning of each school year, there to remain for the period of ninety days or more, when the process of exchange would take place and a new collection be forwarded to each institution. In this way the same collection would not be shipped the second time to a given point, unless by special request, and the 10,000 books necessary to place this feature of the traveling library in operation in North Carolina would furnish new reading material for an indefinite period to 200 schools without replenishing the collections. The great advantage this system of school libraries would have over the system adopted in some states—that of placing permanent collections in every public school,—is that duplication can be avoided. This feature in itself is of marked importance, especially as considered from a financial and progressive standpoint.

No library commission can afford to purchase one hundred copies or more of a single book, unless the nature of the book in question is decidedly of a reference character. It would recognize at once that in furnishing one hundred opportunities to read the same work, the child is denied the privilege of examining one hundred different titles which could be purchased for the same amount of money. The traveling school library for certain schools, therefore, operated by the state during the school's period is logical. With a shorter school term in the South than in some other sections of the Union, a permanent library in inaccessible schools would be idle at least four months in the year with no one to look after it, rebind the books, replenish the collection, etc., or in fact consider the necessities of administration attending such collections during the period.

In reflecting upon the school library when originated in duplicate form, it is very evident that lack of co-operation is the natural result. Libraries alike in every respect are of no assistance to one another, and even though the school libraries in a whole county should be at some future time consolidated, the only result possible would be an increase in the number of books rather than efficiency. Should a library commission,

however, decide to consolidate traveling libraries in a given county into one public library, the effect would be entirely different from the standpoint of usefulness and value. Traveling libraries largely result in the establishment of permanent ones, and the appearance from time to time of a new collection at a given point, is unquestionably more stimulating to advancement along this line than any other system for the building of permanent libraries that could be devised. So much for this question which is clearly within the province of a state library commission.

In attempting to discuss the leading questions of library administration that are better administered when in the hands of a state commission, you will note that I have confined myself closely to studies that at present are engrossing the attention of library authorities throughout the land. North Carolina cannot afford to pass unnoticed such avenues of education as the presence of a commission in this State would insure to every man, woman and child within its confines. With the advent of your commission not only the questions that I have called to your attention would be considered, but others equally important; such as traveling pictures, inter-library loans, special topic collections, the preparation and publication of additional historical matter concerning the state, a thorough bibliography, and lastly, yet of great importance, a bureau of comparative legislation. Let it be known to your assembly that statements of comparative legislation, on any subject, embodying laws of all countries, will be furnished them upon application, and everything you want for the promotion of your general educational system will be more carefully considered than ever before. This feature of the work of a library commission is in operation in a half dozen or more states and has been, beyond a doubt, the most helpful adjunct to library progress within the past ten years.

Lincoln: Master of Men*

By E. WALTER SIKES,

Professor of History in Wake Forest College

A new book on Lincoln is always welcome, especially so at a time when there is a national movement on foot to purchase the old Lincoln home in Kentucky. Mr. Alonzo Rothschild contributes to the ever-increasing literature about Lincoln an illuminating study of one phase of his many-sided character, namely, his mastery of men. It thus differs from a biography of the man in laying consistent emphasis on this one point. It is, as the sub-title indicates, more than the study of any one man; we have a study in character—one of the best illustrations in all history of the way in which a great man, by patience, energy, good sense and tact, may win dominion over the hearts of men. The author shows an accurate knowledge of Lincoln and his times, and at the same time his style is admirable for its picturesqueness and real dramatic power.

Did ever man master more men and more various types than did Lincoln? Norman Hapgood calls him the "Man of the People," but he was more than that. It was in the trying times of war that Lincoln showed the real mastership. But this quality was always in him. The rough frontier life early developed it as it had developed it in many others. Frontier life has ever nurtured self-reliance and the homely virtues that win the respect of the world. Washington had it early, as the many stories in Weems's "Life of Washington" show. Mr. Rothschild has zealously gathered and massed many such stories. Lincoln was the veritable "Samson of the Backwoods," and prided himself on his physical strength. One of the first books that ever came into Lincoln's possession was Weems's "Washington," and its impossible hero. But there are no impossibilities in a boy's vision, and this old book fired the boy with the desire to excel his fellows.

**Lincoln: Master of Men. A study in character.* By Alonzo Rothschild. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906, 531 pp.

One friend of these early days declares that he could "strike with a maul a heavier blow and could sink an axe deeper into wood" than any man he ever saw. His cousin Dennis said: "My, how he would chop! If you heard him fellin' trees in a clearin' you would say there were three men at work, by the way the trees fell."

This very strength and agility gave Lincoln his first leadership among the boys in the Pigeon River region. Those long legs and arms gave him pre-eminence in the wrestling bouts and in the fisticuffs that were the common features of all frontier gatherings. Lincoln took great pride in these feats of his early days, and even after the ballots of a nation had crowned him leader he often spoke of these simple "chaplets of wild olive."

Lincoln always noticed the size of men. When he met a little "strong man" at a state fair, he remarked to him, "Why I could lick salt off the top of your hat." He was a great admirer of Alexander H. Stephens, but did not fail to observe his stature. When they met at the Hampton Roads Conference, Stephens had protected his frail body with a profusion of overcoats. When he had taken them all off, Lincoln remarked to Seward, "That is the largest shucking for so small a nubbin that I ever saw." Even when he was in the White House many callers testify that they had to measure heights with him. He said, "Sumner declined to stand up with me—back to back—and made a fine speech about this being a time for uniting our fronts against the enemy, and not our backs." There was need for all this strength of Lincoln's, for the days of war taxed it to its full extent.

With this physical superiority it was easier for him to gain the intellectual leadership in the western country. He had his share of love, war and politics in this frontier life. He led his neighborhood companions to the Black Hawk war. While there was no fighting against the Indians, he gained some notoriety and learned how to manage a company of men. He knew no tactics; the men were not accustomed to obey, but before the end of the campaign he had them under good control. They respected the man but not the officer. In this same campaign, at the latter part of it, he was the best scout and led the scouting parties.

In early games of politics Lincoln showed his power as a stump speaker. In his county, the Jacksonian Democrats were in the majority, but he cast his lot with the Henry Clay Whigs. In one of these early canvasses he was pitted against an accomplished lawyer who had recently deserted the Whig party. This practised debater made terrible onslaughts on the Whig party and sought to overwhelm the young man with ridicule. It happened as Lincoln rode into town he observed the pretentious new house of the speaker with its lightning rods—the only ones in the county. In his reply Lincoln said, "I desire to live, and I desire place and distinction, but I would rather die now than, like the gentleman, live to see the day that I would change my politics for an office worth three thousand dollars a year, and then feel compelled to erect a lightning rod to protect a guilty conscience from an offended God." The rods had drawn the lightning and his opponent went down to rise no more.

Lincoln's first great struggle, the struggle that brought him before the nation, was the joint discussion with Stephen A. Douglas in 1858. These men had come into Illinois and started life together—one threw his career with the Whigs, the other with the Democrats. In the early thirties they had been in the legislature together. For twenty-five years they had been rivals, but the career of Douglas far outshone Lincoln's. All that Lincoln could show was four terms in the legislature and one in congress. On the other hand Douglas had held many important state offices and had passed on to congress and then to the United States senate, where he was the Democratic leader. These young men were rivals in Illinois during the famous "hard-cider campaign." In these days Lincoln never lost an opportunity to appear on the platform with Douglas. Their next rivalry came in love—not in politics. In this contest Lincoln won.

Lincoln regarded Douglas's rise to eminence with keen disappointment. He pretended to care little for politics, but he could not keep his eye off Douglas. The Whig cause was hopeless and Lincoln was jealous of Douglas, but higher and higher rose the star of the latter. In these days the road to the White House wound through the South. Douglas

was playing for this prize. Compromise after compromise followed on the slavery question. Whenever Douglas would return to Illinois to defend his position, Lincoln was put up to answer him. In one of these contests Douglas said privately to Lincoln: "You understand this question of prohibiting slavery in the territories better than all the opposition in the United States senate. I cannot make anything by debating it with you; you, Lincoln, have, here and at Springfield, given me more trouble than all the opposition in the senate combined."

In 1858 Douglas was renominated for the senate. The new Republican party declared itself for Lincoln. Then followed the greatest debate in the history of the country. Douglas knew Lincoln and did not wish a joint debate. It was true as he said, "Lincoln is unknown and can gain much. Should I win, I shall gain but little. I do not want to go into a debate with Abe."

Douglas, at this time, knew and appreciated Lincoln more fully than did any other man in America. However, the great debate came off. Enthusiasm was on the side of Douglas. The railroads gave him special cars. George B. McClellan gave his private car to Douglas while Lincoln often went on the freight. This debate cost Douglas the nomination for the presidency. Lincoln so cornered him on the slavery question that the Southern Democrats repudiated him as their leader. When the Democratic convention met at Charleston it refused to nominate Douglas. The party split. The northern wing nominated him, but the southern wing chose Breckenridge while the new Republican party chose Douglas's rival. Lincoln did not campaign in 1860. Douglas did, but it was all in vain. Lincoln's star, though slow in rising, had eclipsed that of Douglas.

When Lincoln stepped upon the platform to read his first inaugural he was dressed in fine clothes and carried a new silk hat. Embarrassed as to where to place the precious hat, Douglas stepped forward to the rescue and held the hat while his rival took the oath of office and delivered his inaugural. It may be said, in passing, that Mr. Rothschild is unfair to Douglas and makes him too much of a charlatan.

Throughout the book there is, perhaps, a tendency to dwarf the proportions of other men.

Lincoln's nomination for the presidency was unexpected. In some respects it was the appearance of a "dark horse." Lincoln was no national leader. He was the leader of his party in Illinois, but not elsewhere. His views were not the views of the active element of the Republican party. He was no emancipator; he had never expressed any love for the negro. He had urged Illinois to enforce the fugitive slave law till Wendell Phillips called him the "slave-hound of Illinois." He declared: "I have no purpose—directly or indirectly—to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so. I have no purpose to introduce equality, political or social. I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is because that much is due to necessity." He wrote Stephens on the eve of his inauguration, "The South is in no more danger in respect to slavery than it was in the days of Washington." These were no radical views. What he contended for was that congress should not permit the extension of slavery into the territories.

There were other men more conspicuous in party councils. There were others with national reputation. Among these was the senator from New York—William Henry Seward—who was the natural standard-bearer of the new Republican party which he had done so much to organize. He had made radical utterances on the slavery question; he foreshadowed "the irrepressible conflict" and declared that there was "a higher law than the constitution;" he was partner of Thurlow Weed who had organized at Albany the most vicious lobby of the day. On the first ballot he received 173 votes, but the third ballot determined the choice and that choice was Lincoln. The followers of Seward were indignant. They declared that it was the "triumph of unobjectionable mediocrity," that the most eminent leader of the party had been sacrificed, in the language of Webster twelve years before, to the "sagacious, wise, far-seeing doc-

trine of availability." Lincoln himself had thought that Seward would be chosen and told his friends that there was no use talking to him about the presidency whilst there were such men as Seward, Chase and others; that everybody knew them, while nobody, scarcely, outside of Illinois, knew him. Lincoln had once described himself as "something of a Seward Whig." On the very day of his nomination Lincoln determined that if he were elected Seward should be given the first portfolio in the cabinet, as he was the "generally recognized leader of the party." When elected Seward received the offer and accepted with many misgivings. From Lincoln's election to his inauguration were trying days. The Southern States were seceding; the Buchanan administration did nothing. Seward in the senate was the voice of the incoming administration. He did all he could to hold things together during these uncertain days. Lincoln determined to have a mixed cabinet; to form it from men of both the old parties. He determined to appoint Chase, Cameron, Blair and Welles, formerly Democrats, and Seward, Bates and Smith, formerly Whigs. Seward's friends did not want Chase in the cabinet, for Chase's friends had nominated Lincoln.

After much bickering and refusing Seward finally entered the cabinet. Seward felt and the party felt that he was to be the leader of the administration, as Webster had been in the Taylor cabinet. They all thought Lincoln a weak, mediocre man. On the day that Seward accepted he wrote his wife, "I have advised Mr. L. that I will not decline. It is inevitable. I will try to save freedom and my country." Later he wrote, "I am the only hopeful, calm, conciliatory person here." Seward was sure that he was to be the Wolsey of the administration and carry "law in his voice and honor in his hand." He busied himself in all the departments. He was tireless in his suggestions to the president, "this simple provincial statesman from the backwoods." Mr. Lincoln saw the aspirations of Seward and watched him calmly as in the old days he eyed his opponent in a wrestling match. He was taking the measure of the man whose place common report said he had. Whether

or not Seward was to rule the president was brought to a decision in a way that settled matters once for all. Seward wrote out on April 1 "Some Thoughts for the Consideration of the President." These "Thoughts" outlined a plan for the president and indirectly advised that the policy be left to him. In reply Lincoln wrote, "I remark that if this must be done, I must do it." Lincoln quietly folded the "Thoughts" away in his desk and never mentioned them to anyone—not even to Seward. Thus ended Seward's dream of domination. He had met his master, and that master had in his possession the paper that could be his undoing. From that day onward Seward served Lincoln with unfeigned devotion and faithfulness. He wrote his wife, "Executive skill and vigor are rare qualities. The president is the best of us." Time and again Seward chafed on the bit, but he never kicked out. Lincoln let him have his way in many things, but the mastery was with Lincoln and Seward knew it. Seward renounced all aspirations for himself and dedicated himself to Lincoln without reserve.

The indispensable man to Lincoln's administration, Mr. Rothschild says, was Salmon P. Chase. He had been an Abolitionist, had allied himself with the Democratic party, and then with the Free-soilers, or with any party that would take up the question of slavery. He took high rank in the new Republican party and was one of the candidates for nomination for the presidency in 1860. He was the opposite of Lincoln in many respects. He was a scholar, perfect in his manners, the Chesterfield of the cabinet, and could not endure Lincoln's coarse jokes and rough humor. He was a strong man and had a strong following. Lincoln determined to have him in his cabinet if he had Seward. Chase had abundant conceit and self-esteem. He did not like a subordinate place in the cabinet. He felt that he was as good as Seward. After some persuasion he agreed to become secretary of the treasury, a very responsible and important place. Lincoln knew nothing of finances. He once defined wealth as "the superfluity of the things we don't need." When bankers came to see him he always referred them to Chase. Chase, like Seward, thought he was a stronger man

than Lincoln. He was deeply impressed with the idea that the war was not being waged wisely and that he could improve matters. All through his cabinet career Chase had an animus toward the president. He never forgave him for obtaining the nomination in the Chicago convention. He could never understand why this provincial backwoodsman should insist on running the administration while he, with all his ability and learning, was made only the head of a department. Chase was a masterful man who had met his master, but would not or could not see it. Seward learned Lincoln quickly. Chase never did, and there were many others who did not. Chase thought Lincoln a "man irresolute, but of honest intentions; uncertain of himself, and in many things ready to lean too much on others." From the beginning Chase, though a member of the president's political family, disparaged the administration. Lincoln was not Chase's ideal of a man. Chase was very serious and reverent, while Lincoln's bump of reverence was very small. Chase once told with positive disgust how the president interrupted a cabinet meeting to let his old friend Orlando Kellogg come in and tell them the story of the stuttering justice. Chase in his diary tells how Lincoln disfigured the most important cabinet meeting during the administration—the one concerning the Emancipation Proclamation—by reading from Artemus Ward the "High-handed Outrage of Utica."

But Lincoln knew Chase and would not let him go. Chase wanted to disrupt the cabinet. He managed to turn the leading Republicans against Seward. He wanted to oust Seward so that his influence, as he thought, might be dominant, but Lincoln wanted them both. Time and again Chase threatened to resign and did many times, but Lincoln prevailed on him to continue. Finally Chase began to work for the nomination as successor of Lincoln. He had expected the nomination in 1856 and in 1860. Now, he was seeking to supplant Lincoln while still a member of his cabinet. This made Lincoln's friends indignant. They appealed to Lincoln to dismiss him, but they met with refusal.

In reply to his friends, Lincoln said: "No, gentlemen, the times are too grave and perilous for ambitious schemes and

personal rivalries. I need the aid of all these men. If we succeed there will be glory enough for all."

Of Chase he said: "Of all the great men I have ever known Chase is equal to about one and a half of the best of them. Mr. Chase makes a good secretary and I shall keep him where he is. I hope we may never have a worse man." But the "homely, honest, ungainly Abe," as Professor Gray called him, was politician enough to know that he could easily get rid of Chase's presidential boom, which he did in due season.

Chase disliked any interference by the president in the treasury appointments. He did not regard the fact that appointments had to be made with some regard to their political effect. In collisions of this kind Chase would resign, but Lincoln would bring him back or positively refuse to accept his resignation. But in 1864 Lincoln accepted his resignation, much to the surprise of Chase. Lincoln said, "Chase is a very able man. He is a very ambitious man and I think on the presidency a little insane." Lincoln showed that he could subdue any personal animosity by appointing Chase to the Supreme Court bench a few months later. When he took the oath of office for the second time, Chase was the justice who administered the oath.

But of all the strange characters that ever Lincoln met or tried to tame Edwin M. Stanton was the most unique. None but a Lincoln ever would have brought Stanton into his family. Stanton had always spoken harshly of him; had ridiculed him before the war and had no confidence in his ability when he became president. He had always been a Democrat, but fought secession bitterly. He was a harsh, bitter, acrid man. He and Lincoln had met once before in a lawsuit on the same side and Stanton described Lincoln as a "long, lank creature from Illinois, wearing a dirty linen duster for a coat, on the back of which the perspiration had splotched wide stains that resembled a map of the continent. The affair chagrined Lincoln and he remarked, "I have never been so brutally treated as by that man Stanton." Even after Lincoln became president Stanton alluded to him as the "original guerilla." Yet, Lincoln brushed all these things aside and in January, 1862, appointed him secretary of war.

Buchanan had called Stanton to his cabinet in 1860. Stanton thought that Lincoln called him for the same purpose—to keep it from falling to pieces. In Stanton's makeup there was no grace of manner, little kindness of heart, no forbearance or mercy, and little that was lovely. He was a huge, rough giant, bent on his own way; obstinate, full of personal prejudice and intolerance. To control this untamed lion would take a master of men, and yet Lincoln undertook the task. Of him Lincoln said, "I have faith in affirmative men like these. They stand between a nation and perdition." Stanton had no tact, but Lincoln had tact enough for both of them. It would be very easy to prove by competent testimony that Stanton ruled Lincoln. Many and many a time he positively refused to obey the president's orders. On one occasion Lincoln said to a friend, "You must know I have very little influence with this administration. You must see Stanton." Stanton insulted congressmen and bullied applicants and on one occasion, when an applicant came with an order direct from the president, said that "if the president signed that order he was a damned fool." When the remark was reported to Lincoln, he only said, "If Stanton said I was a damned fool, then I must be one; for he is nearly always right, and generally says what he means."

When asked why he did not put Stanton out, he said it would be difficult to find another to fill his place. Yet in spite of all these things, Lincoln ruled Stanton. He said the way to manage him was to "let him jump awhile." Lincoln used Stanton to do things he could not well do himself. Stanton found out that he was over-matched on one occasion when he refused to do what the president wanted done. Then the president, eyeing Stanton fixedly, calmly said, "Mr. Secretary, it will have to be done." These conflicts were not on general policies, but matters of detail. Lincoln needed Stanton and would not let him go. When urged to appoint him to the Supreme Court bench, he said, "If you will find me another secretary of war like him, I will gladly appoint him."

This fierce old Teuton came to regard his master with feelings of affection. Of the group who stood around his dying bed the grief of none was keener than of this iron minister of

war. As his soul passed away, the grim-visaged son of Mars said, "There lies the most perfect ruler of men the world has ever seen."

And what was the secret of Lincoln's wonderful power over men? How was it that he could use men of various types and lead not the backwoodsmen only, but the learned and the wise? Among Lincoln's qualities were these. He was sincere. He kept his vision unclouded. He did not want to justify his case only. He wanted to see the truth. He could not argue for the side he believed to be wrong. He was religious in the sense that his conscience was his master and he served his country with devotion. Self he submerged. He had convictions of his own and he dared stand by them. The lesser end he surrendered that he might gain the greater. With a mental machinery like this, it is not to be wondered that as the new problems multiplied his mind became clearer, his heart purer, and his hand steadier. No man with passion and hatred could have gone through the four years of bitter strife and been the great captain he was. He did the four things that Dr. Van Dyke says a man "must learn to do if he would make his record true," namely:

"To think without confusion clearly,
To love his fellow-men sincerely,
To act from honest motives purely,
To trust in God and Heaven securely."

BOOK REVIEWS

THE AMERICAN NATION: A HISTORY. Volume XI. The Federalist System, 1789-1801. By John Spencer Bassett. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1906,—xviii, 327 pp.

Southern historical scholarship has not counted for much until recent years. In fact the segregation of Southerners after Jefferson's day, and finally the violence and turmoil of the Civil War closed the doors of the greater American public to all Southern literary effort. And to make certain their exclusion the best of Southern talent insisted quite naturally, until recent years, on appearing before the world on all possible occasions as special pleaders. During the last two decades a change has come and it begins to look as if the real nationalists, the men who can view all phases of our history sympathetically and give to all sections fair and discriminating criticism, are Southerners.

That such is recognized at least to a large extent is shown in the selection of Professor Bassett to write the volume of the "American Nation" treating the critical and difficult theme "The Federalist System." The book as completed now before us is no disappointment. It contains no over-laudation of such great Federalists as Alexander Hamilton, and it does no injustice to the greatest opponent of Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, who sometimes took rather sharp advantages of his rival. Professor Bassett knows how to estimate the really important historical points in the careers of these bitter political enemies, without taking sides, without entering into the details of their feuds.

Besides treating the political history of 1789 to 1801 the work in hand supplies excellent brief accounts of the social and economic forces then at work, pictures now and then of that half aristocratic court with which President and "Lady" Washington surrounded themselves in Philadelphia in the last decade of the eighteenth century. And it was no disparagement of the democratic ideals of the age that the first gentleman of his country and the most popular man of his

time should not readily lay aside the little fancies and larger social distinctions current in the Old Dominion long after uncouth Jeffersonianism assumed sway in our national political life.

The more interesting topics of this volume are the accounts of the organization of the Republican party, the quarrels with England and France, the difficulties of Washington's position as a non-partisan president, the imperialism of Hamilton and the sturdy good faith of John Adams. Of maps and diagrams there are a goodly number and, it must be said in passing, they are of the very best. The critical essay on the sources available is well worth the space it occupies and it may be turned to with confidence by all classes of readers.

A word ought to be said about the author's treatment of the intrigues of 1796 to 1800, for the turn which these took had much to do with the epochal defeat of Adams and the election of Jefferson as his successor. Immediately after the choice of Adams in 1796 became known, Jefferson, the incoming vice-president and opponent, it must be remembered, of the administration about to begin work, took steps looking to the isolation of Hamilton in national affairs comparable to the attempt of Hamilton just before the election to defeat and isolate Adams. For a moment the astute Virginia Democrat seemed to have won to himself the blunt Massachusetts leader. The possibilities of such a good understanding could hardly be imagined. But the *rapprochement* failed and the vice-president remained the active head of the opposition.

The next and less agreeable intrigue was that which kept the majority of Adams's cabinet under the thumb of Hamilton. Conscious of Hamilton's many infidelities to him the president continued to work in harness with his unwilling subordinates until the attempt to dictate the policy of the administration by Hamilton became patent to all. Probably the best example of this outside interference may be seen in Hamilton's game of 1798-99 when Washington was made use of as a pawn on the chess board. At last without taking counsel with any of his cabinet the president broke the fetters with which his administration had been held to the

New Yorker's policy by sending in to the already dictatorial senate the nomination of Vans Murray to be a special envoy to France. To be sure, the opposition, guided by the president of the senate, whose eyes were never closed to the wrangles of the Federalists, profited most by these intrigues.

Professor Bassett unravels the entangled skein and lets the truth vindicate whom it will. Certainly Hamilton does not appear to advantage though the author gives the most favorable account possible consistent with the evidence. Washington's rôle, it seems to the reviewer, was most to his discredit; it does not add to the dignity of the heroic figure of the Revolution to be used as clay in the potter's hand for several years by his astute former secretary. It is possible only to the student of unvarnished history to believe that the great ex-president was made to dictate to the president his most important appointments and that against the will of the latter. Washington even advised the usurpation by Hamilton, then inspector-general of the provisional army, of the functions of the secretary of war.

The author does not comment on this remarkable conduct probably for lack of space, possibly because he, like Ranke, thinks that the sole duty of the historian consists in relating the facts. And this has been well and clearly done. "The Federalist System" must take its place among the best of the series to which it belongs, which is decided praise since the ablest of American historians are his co-workers. He has performed a difficult task well and all Southern scholars ought to take a pride in his success.

WM. E. DODD.

Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.

THE LIFE OF JOHN WESLEY. By C. T. Winchester. The Macmillan Company, 1906,—xiii, 301 pp.

John Wesley, long idealized by one of the great denominations of the Christian church and looked upon as a somewhat fanatical and bigoted reformer by others, is now recognized as one of the great men of modern history—great in

his influence on the social and political, as well as the religious, life of the world. Lecky's "History of the Eighteenth Century" was the first adequate appreciation of the far-reaching significance of Wesley's work in England. More recently Mr. Augustine Birrell's brilliant essay and a leading editorial in the London *Spectator* have revealed the interest in Wesley on the part of not only churchmen, but men of letters. The publication of the "Heart of Wesley's Journal" was a revelation to a wider circle of readers of the charm of his life. But there has been no adequate short life of Wesley to set forth the modern view of him and to supplement, if not take the place of, the far from satisfactory lives of Tyerman and Southey.

Professor Winchester, of Wesleyan University, was of all men in America probably the best man to do this. A life-long Methodist, sympathetic with the traditions and vital faith of his church, an authority on hymnology, he is also a man deeply versed in literature and able to see Wesley from the standpoint of the humanist. Thus equipped by temperament, training and patient research, he has written a biography admirable in every respect. Discrimination, balance of judgment, sympathy with the ideals of Wesley, and a style notable for its clearness and force, are everywhere apparent. The author is not blind to Wesley's limitations—his lack of humor and of leisure, for instance—but he has at the same time presented him as "a marked and striking personality, energetic, scholarly, alive to all moral, social and political questions, and for some thirty years probably exerting greater influence than any other man in England."

The biography is first of all a consistent, well-jointed story of Wesley's life. Each period is carefully distinguished as to its relation to other periods. Particularly good is the analysis of the Oxford period which the author speaks of as the monastic period. The strong points in Wesley's character are properly emphasized—his unselfishness, his prodigious energy, his mastery of men, and his remarkable power of administration. Professor Winchester, as a result of his careful study of the journal and letters of Wesley, emphasizes points not heretofore sufficiently noted. Wesley

was fond of music, being criticised by some of his brethren for attending an oratorio. If not a scholar in the modern sense, he was "a man of literary tastes, of broad outlook, and genuine culture." "Never was so tireless a reader, though he spent little time in the four walls of a library." He had no liking for controversy, nor was he a dogmatist. When the question arose as to the revision of certain articles of faith he said, "If they are true, they will bear the strictest examination. Let us all pray for a willingness to receive light." He was not much concerned about the opinions of Methodists: "Is thy heart right as my heart is with thine? I ask no further question. If it be, give me thy hand. Dost thou love and serve God? It is enough. I give thee the right hand of fellowship."

A most significant feature of the book is the presentation of the eighteenth century as a background for Wesley's work. The author's knowledge of the literature of the period—novels, essays, and poems—stood him in good stead. It would be difficult to find in a brief compass so accurate and incisive a summary of the life of the century as is found in pages 71-82. While Wesley's mission was to reform the life of his time he was far more a man of his age than has been generally thought. He wrote and preached in a "plain, sound English" style. His advice to one of his preachers, "Don't scream, Sammy, never scream," was characteristic of the man. While he was opposed on the one hand by the lukewarm established church, he had some of his sorest trials with the fanaticism of his followers. He had all the eighteenth century confidence in sense and reason. His appeals were made to reason; and he did not encourage the physical manifestations that attended his meetings.

Throughout the book the author holds, as he says Wesley did, the finest balance between superstition and genuine personal religion—"the experimental religion that speaks bold in Methodist sermons and rings glad in Methodist song." Professor Winchester agrees with Lecky and other historians that Wesley was a great moral influence, but he finds the secret of this influence in an intimate sense of the everlasting verities. Wesley was a religious man "filled with a

sense of the presence of God and of the force of spiritual laws *here and now*, convinced of an immediate relation between himself and the Supreme Being." E. M.

THE LAUNCHING OF A UNIVERSITY. By Daniel Colt Gilman. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1906,—386 pp.

"I have heard travelers say," says Dr. Gilman, "that the pleasantest part of travel is the coming home. I have sometimes thought so, and I have also thought that the pleasantest part of life is its closing chapter, when memories take the place of hopes, cares are lessened, opportunities are enlarged, and friendships multiplied and intensified." It is in this happy and complacent spirit that the author has reviewed the term of his connection with the Johns Hopkins University and made incidental references to his life both before and after that period. Every one of that large and remarkable group of American scholars who studied at Hopkins in its first twenty-five years of existence will find here a fresh breath out of their own past; they will read with pleasure a new and intimate account of the personality of Johns Hopkins, the benefactor, the problems of the first years, the hopes and disappointments—although Dr. Gilman says but little about the latter—and the old days will come back again. Most of all they will be delighted with the pleasant words about the great teachers who helped launch the institution and who gave to them individually both fire and fuel for many a long day of anxious labor.

It is not too much to say that the founding of the Johns Hopkins University began an epoch in American education. Dr. Gilman tells how, when a graduate just from Yale, he sought to get advanced instruction at Yale and Harvard. A year at the former was devoted to desultory reading under the advice of able professors, but it was not planned for regular instruction and the author adds that he believes it was wasted. The next year he went to Harvard, where the conditions were not better than those at Yale. At each institution were great teachers and delightful academic life, but

neither these, nor any other universities in America then offered advanced work. It was this condition, which was essentially the same in 1876 as when Gilman graduated in 1852, that appealed to the founders of the new university in Baltimore. They would offer the American student an opportunity for special study and investigation. This decision, although it was concurred in by the trustees and strongly advised by many prominent men, was chiefly the outcome of the sagacity and insistence of President Gilman. It will be a long time before we can forget what the results of it have been. They have raised the best American thought to a scientific basis—not entirely through the efforts of the Hopkins, but through the impulse which that institution gave abroad and which has found intelligent and enthusiastic response in a hundred other universities.

Dr. Gilman shows himself an intelligent leader of educational thought, not only by his enthusiasm for investigation, but by his consciousness of its limitations. Particularly he deplores the tendency of small and poorly equipped institutions to offer graduate courses where they have neither library nor faculty to warrant such an undertaking. It is a protest born of the very consciousness of exact truth, and that, as Dr. Gilman continually shows, is the essence of the Hopkins spirit.

One ought to speak, also, of the delightfully intimate style in which the author presents his recollections. It is chaste, happy with allusions to literature, and sparkles with those well turned phrases which characterize his spoken messages. Nor can the reviewer ignore the "Addresses on Various Occasions" which fill the latter half of this interesting book. Here one finds several of the best general academic lectures of recent years. Special mention, if space were here available, ought to be made of the lecture on "Research," delivered at Chicago University, in June, 1903. It is an inspiring presentation of the advantages of research as a means of higher education and as a support of good thinking. Dr. Gilman's book should be read by every teacher above the rank of primary instruction. J. S. BASSETT.

EDWARD FITZ GERALD: ENGLISH MEN OF LETTERS. By A. C. Benson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905, 207 pp.

Mr. A. C. Benson, in his recent life of Edward Fitz Gerald, has given a vivid picture of this rarely gifted but strangely unproductive man of letters.

Edward Fitz Gerald holds a unique place in English literary annals and this place is due to three things: to felicitous translation of Omar Khayyam, to his remarkable letters, full of the indefinable charm of temperament and personality, and to his genius for friendship, which enabled him to win the love of Tennyson, Carlyle, Thackeray, and many other distinguished Englishmen, and through life to hold them in such a way as to compel Tennyson, when asked at the end of his life which of his friends he had loved the best, to reply unhesitatingly, "Why, old Fitz, to be sure!"

Fitz Gerald was well equipped for translation and particularly of a poem of the type of Omar Khayyam's *Rubaiyat*. He was whimsical and fastidious in his tastes, and therefore likely to be attracted by anything out of the ordinary. He was melancholy in temperament and had felt keenly the iron wheel of life, and was temperamentally drawn to the great Oriental poem of fatalism. He was not a man of creative imagination, but he had a thorough sense for form in literature, and a faultless taste—"the feminine of genius," his own aphorism calls it—, and his third qualification of a translator he himself has named with justness: "I suppose very few people have ever taken such pains in translation as I have." Fitz Gerald was thus uncommonly well equipped to render into English the old Persian poet whom Fitz Gerald's translation had made familiar to all readers of our literature. For Fitz Gerald translation was a nobler art than original composition and he had a style that lent itself wonderfully well as a medium for carrying on the thought of others. He is not an illustration of his own fine aphorism that "all who have the best to tell, have also naturally the best way of telling it."

Fitz Gerald's letters have enduring human interest because they are so full of a minute and almost passionate interest in humanity, and a minute and tender observation of

men; and because they are so full of his friendships and friends. They have, too, a permanent literary fragrance, brimful as they are of literary judgments, and appreciations and estimates of books. His likes and dislikes were very pronounced; and his judgments not always just or sure, but they are always his own and have an indefinable personal flavor and charm. As Mr. Benson very justly remarks:

"With all his limitations, and they were many and obvious, it still remains true of Fitz Gerald that he was one of those, who are even fewer than we are apt to think, who have loved high literature with a real instinctive and passionate joy."

This passionate lover of high literature, this friend of poets and prophets, with all his fond longings and clinging tenderness, with his limitations, his gentle and pathetic philosophy born of his frank recognition of his own defects and realization that these defects were too strong for him,—in short, Edward Fitz Gerald in round completeness Mr. Benson has set forth with much enthusiasm, but at the same time with the balanced judgment of a judicious critic.

W. P. FEW.

THE NEGRO AND THE NATION. By George S. Merriam. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1906,—iv, 436 pp.

We have in this work a scholarly study of the relation of the negro to national politics throughout the whole period of our country's existence. The story of slavery and of the difficult questions and bitter contests and bloody struggles which grew out of it, though not new, is here retold in a way to arouse fresh interest. The author has with wide knowledge and an unbiased mind followed the path of the negro through the devious ways of American political history from colonial times through Reconstruction when the negro problem ceased to be the central feature in national politics. His book is noteworthy for its striking pictures and fair and discriminating character estimates of the great leaders on both sides of the long struggle over the institution of slavery.

The last few chapters deal with the present aspect of the

negro problem. A splendid tribute is paid to General Armstrong and to those who have worked with him and after him in the constructive movement inaugurated at Hampton for the uplifting of the negro race. The restrictions and obstacles which hamper the negro are: the legal and extra-legal limitation of his suffrage, the social discrimination against even the most intelligent and highly trained negroes, the disposition in some quarters to limit narrowly the amount and character of negro education, the subjection of the negro to abuse such as peonage or lynching, and, most serious, the threatened narrowing of the negro's industrial opportunities. Notwithstanding these obstacles, Mr. Merriam takes a hopeful view of the general outlook. He cites the heavy expenditures of the South for the education of the blacks, especially commending the progressive work for education done by Governor Aycock. Though a reactionary as to negro education, Governor Vardaman, of Mississippi, has stood firmly against the lynching abuse. Southern judges and juries have put their stamp of disapproval upon peonage. There is a notable growth of the higher order of industrial schools. The general discussion of race matters is being carried on in a broader and saner way.

For the future, the industrial situation is of first importance. Industrial freedom of choice—the opportunity to enter the various occupations and trades—should be eagerly sought and jealously guarded. The forces which would exclude the negro and narrow the range of his industrial opportunity are most to be feared. Unfortunately, there are such forces at work in many quarters. As to education, good common schools and thorough industrial training are needed, but “there can be no fit common schools for the black unless there are worthy normal schools and colleges.” Upon broader grounds, there is need among the blacks of “scholars and idealists, as well as toilers; and for these there should be their natural atmosphere.” Politically “the most pressing need will be substantially met if the South will carry out in good faith the provisions of her statute-books.” The negro should be fairly allowed to cast his vote when he can meet the statutory tests. With regard to the relation of the

national government to the negro problem, Mr. Merriam believes that in communities "where the black element is strong in numbers and in character, and where the dark race offers fit incumbents for office, there should be a fair number of such appointments." He is opposed to any scheme for the reduction of the representation of the South under the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment on the ground that such a measure "would recognize, accept and confirm that very exclusion of the negro vote against which it professes to be aimed." He would favor national aid to Southern education such as was contemplated by the Blair bill. On the matter of "social equality" of the races, the author believes in simply dealing "with every man according to his fitness, his merits, and his needs, regardless of the color of his skin." He says further: "If the white people of the Southern States, for reasons peculiar to their section, follow a different rule, they have still no occasion for wonder and dismay at the practice in other sections, or for indignation when the highest official in the American capital follows the general usage of the civilized world."

It cannot be expected that all of Mr. Merriam's views will find ready acceptance. But what he has to urge is strongly supported by fair-minded reasoning, and his book deserves a wide circulation North and South. It is an important contribution to the understanding of the negro question and it will do good wherever read.

W. H. G.

LITERARY NOTES

The latest instalment of *The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science* is a double number on "Early Diplomatic Negotiations of the United States with Russia," by John C. Hildt. It is a careful summary of our relations with the empire of the Czar from Dana's mission in 1781 till the treaty of 1824. The sources of information are chiefly the diplomatic archives in Washington with the personal correspondence of many public men of the day. The author, who has worked accessible American authorities with commendable spirit, seems to have had no access to the correspondence of the Russian minister with his own court. Without this it is impossible to have a full picture of the diplomacy of the two nations. Short of this standard—which is a difficult one—Mr. Hildt has made a reliable and useful examination of his subject. It will be of much service to the future students and writers of American diplomatic history.

This edition by Dr. Bruner of Hugo's famous romantic tragedy is intended primarily for school use. The introduction discusses the theory of the romantic as opposed to the classic drama, the improvements by Hugo of the stiff Alexandrine verse of his predecessors, and his "renovation and restoration" of simple, direct and natural language to its proper place in the drama. There follow an outline and a discussion of the main and sub plots, and a sympathetic and appreciative estimate of the various characters of the play. Copious footnotes are given, and various parallel passages are cited from French, English and German authors. Dr. Bruner does not pretend to offer here an original contribution to the study of the romantic drama. His book does, however, present in convenient form the main points that Hugo fought for, and this new edition of "Hernani" may no doubt be used advantageously in the class-room.

(Hugo's *Hernani*. Edited by James D. Bruner. American Book Company).

